

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

WORSENING ANTI-SEMITISM IN ARGENTINA

HON. MEL LEVINE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1983

● Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, this morning's Washington Post ran an article titled "Anti-Semitism on Rise in Argentina." It contained a seemingly endless litany of repulsive anti-Semitic acts and violence against Jews in Argentina, the home of Latin America's largest Jewish community.

Moises Camji, the vice president of the political arm of a number of Jewish organizations in Argentina, said:

There is fear that the tremendous social and economic chaos we are experiencing will be manipulated by Nazi-fascist groups. There is the historical precedent.

Herman Schiller, director of a progressive Argentine Jewish weekly has stated:

Paradoxically, anti-Semitism grows in Argentina during a democratic opening because it is used as a destabilizing factor by fascist groups connected with the security forces, or by right-wing coup-mongers.

The anti-Semitic acts outlined in the article include: the mushrooming sales of virulently anti-Jewish publications, which have stepped up their attacks on Jews; the sale of far-right and Nazi tracts openly sold in newspaper kiosks throughout downtown Buenos Aires; the complete sellout within a few weeks of appearance at street vendors of the anti-Semitic book, "The International Jew"; the featuring on a number of radio programs of avowedly Fascist and racist speakers, assailing Argentina's Jewish community and Israel, and praising Adolf Hitler; within a 4-month period, hundreds of acts of vandalism, telephone threats and bomb scares against Jews; the vandalizing of at least four synagogues in the capital; bomb threats at about 45 Jewish schools, at one of which a bomb was found outside and deactivated. The litany goes on and on.

Last month the cover of a weekly newsmagazine showed a Star of David splashed with paint and the question, "Is it dangerous to be Jewish in Argentina?" The article appeared to answer its own question "yes."

Mr. Speaker, these are deeply disturbing signs coming from the Argentine Government at a time when they are moving toward their first election in 7 years. The present regime can

never be accused of concern for human rights of any group, and now the Jews in particular are being used as scapegoats once again.

This can only bring sadness to those who are deeply concerned for the human rights, safety and freedom of all people, but especially for those who have always been in the minority and therefore more vulnerable to mistreatment and harassment.

Following is the complete text of the Post article. I urge my colleagues to read it.

Thank you.

ANTI-SEMITISM ON RISE IN ARGENTINA

(By Martin Andersen)

BUENOS AIRES.—Against a backdrop of deteriorating social conditions and political uncertainty, Jewish community leaders and others are voicing increasing concern about a recent upsurge in anti-Semitism and violence against Jews here.

Jews say current conditions have not yet reached the level of violence of three years ago, when synagogues and Jewish-owned businesses were bombed and homes were sprayed by gunfire. However, growing social unrest and an apparent government unwillingness, or inability, to control the outbreak has spawned fears that more violence lies ahead.

Argentina is home to Latin America's largest Jewish community, which ranks as the world's seventh largest.

"There is fear that the tremendous social and economic chaos we are experiencing will be manipulated by Nazi-fascist groups," said Moises Camji, vice president of the DAIA, the political arm of most Jewish organizations here. "There is the historical precedent, and what happens here doesn't have to occur in exactly the same way."

"We are living in a moment of total anarchy," said Rabbi Marshall Meyer, an American, leader of the Bet El Synagogue here and head of Buenos Aires' Jewish Rabbinical Seminary. "There is no government; social and economic conditions are disastrous."

The most visible evidence of rising anti-Semitism, observers here say, are the mushrooming sales of virulently anti-Jewish publications, which have stepped up their attacks on Jews.

Far-right and Nazi tracts are openly sold in newspaper kiosks throughout downtown Buenos Aires. Street vendors say that one book, "The International Jew," sold out within a few weeks of hitting the stands.

In addition, a number of radio programs here and in the provinces recently have featured avowedly fascist and racist speakers, assailing Argentina's Jewish community and Israel, and praising Adolf Hitler. Early last month, Jewish community protests resulted in an abrupt end of a two-hour anti-Semitic, late-night radio broadcast that ran for six weeks on state-run radio.

The recently formed Jewish Movement for Human Rights, led by Rabbi Meyer, has announced plans for a protest march

Monday against the increase in anti-Semitic acts.

Jewish leaders and others here are particularly concerned about the increasing violence against Jews. Within a four-month period, hundreds of acts of vandalism, telephone threats and bomb scares have set the Jewish community on edge.

At least four synagogues have been vandalized in the capital. About 45 Jewish schools have received bomb threats, and at one a bomb found outside the building had to be deactivated.

Late last month, the cover of the weekly newsmagazine Siete Dias showed a Star of David splashed with paint and the question: "Is it dangerous to be Jewish in Argentina?" The article, which chronicled more than two decades of often deadly anti-Semitism here, appeared to answer its own question with a barely qualified "yes."

In May, a restaurant in the Once neighborhood was sprayed with machine-gun fire while 30 people were inside, and in August a local synagogue was peppered with bullets.

Jews have also been the object of a stepped-up campaign of telephone threats. Last month the far-right Pedro Giacchino Commando Group turned its attention to several prominent Jews and issued a communique calling on Argentines to arm themselves and fight the "traitors."

Two days before Rosh Hashana, the Jewish new year, more than a dozen people attacked a synagogue in the South Atlantic coastal town of Comodoro Rivadavia. The group, wielding axes and other sharp instruments, broke windows and a door. They also painted swastikas and threats on the building.

The group, described as well-coordinated and organized, also attacked most of the businesses and homes of the 30 Jewish families living there.

"It was the closest thing to a pogrom here in a long time," Meyer said.

A group of more than 30 parents called for the immediate dismissal of Buenos Aires municipal officials after a group of about 25 children, some as young as 6, was threatened and abused by health personnel while undergoing routine physicals Sept. 16. The parents said the employees taunted the children with insults such as "You Jew S.O.B." and "You should be sent to the gas chambers."

Late last month a burst of machine-gun fire raked the facade of a kosher pizzeria in the Once neighborhood near the center of town.

In recent days in both the Once, a popular commercial district, and the nearby middle-class neighborhood of Caballito, Jewish homes and businesses have been targets of vandalism. In Caballito a number of Jewish-owned stores were painted with the words "Ghetto 1983."

Municipal education officials condemned the incident and ordered an investigation.

There is a growing feeling here that the current rash of incidents is the work of far-right groups seeking to undermine Argentina's return to constitutional rule, slated in January.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by the Member on the floor.

"Paradoxically," said Herman Schiller, director of the progressive, 30,000-circulation Jewish weekly, *Nueva Presencia*, "anti-Semitism grows in Argentina during a democratic opening because it is used as a destabilizing factor by fascist groups connected with the security forces, or by right-wing coup-mongers."

Concern is also being expressed over the nature of the Peronist party, traditionally the country's majority political grouping and the likely winner in the presidential election scheduled for Oct. 30. Fears here that far-right groups are seeking to influence the working-class-based party were heightened last month, following a series of public declarations by Alberto Ottalagano, former rector of the University of Buenos Aires.

In an interview with a local newsmagazine he admitted he is a facist and said he joined Peronism because he believed the movement's founder, Juan D. Peron, was sympathetic to Europe's right-wing regimes of the 1930s.

In a recent issue of *Siete Dias*, Ottalagano attempted to explain his remarks, in which he recommended that Jews "try to refrain from arousing Aryan anger."

"I say the Jews ought to avoid showing themselves too much," he said. "They should avoid sticking out—meddling in Argentine politics as a community. . . . This offends. This irritates."

A number of prominent Peronists took issue with Ottalagano's remarks, pointing to the participation of many Jews in the movement.

Jewish leaders, however, privately expressed dismay over the apparent reluctance of Peronist presidential candidate Italo Argentino Luder to repudiate Ottalagano publicly, as well as the acts of violence. Following the attacks in Commodore Rivadavia, 45 politicians and intellectuals signed a statement condemning the violence, including Luder's chief rival, Radical Party candidate Raul Alfonsin. Deolindo Bittel, the Peronist vice presidential candidate, was the highest ranking party member to do so.

Early this month, Luder denied at a press conference that there has been a new outbreak of anti-Semitism. "All there have been are a few incidents, as unfortunately occur in a modern country," he said, attributing the increasing concern over the issue to "an excess of sensibility."

Last week, top candidates from most of the country's major parties pledged to fight anti-Semitism in Argentina. Speaking at a meeting of the DAIA, Bittel said his party "will do everything in our power to put an end to discrimination."

Community spokesmen here agree that despite thousands of acts of anti-Semitic violence in recent years, they cannot point to one arrest, a point brought up by the DAIA during a recent meeting with President Reynaldo Bignone. Many Jews feel that record is due in large part to the fact that the doors to the chambers of political power here, the military hierarchy and the labor unions, are still shut to them.●

GUS STAVROS REPRESENTS WHAT IS GOOD ABOUT AMERICA

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1983

● Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the 1983 B'nai B'rith "Great American Traditions Award" for the Tampa Bay area is being presented to Mr. Gus A. Stavros, president of Better Business Forms, Inc., and I am delighted to have the opportunity to serve as the honorary cochairman of this year's banquet held in Mr. Stavros' honor on November 12, 1983.

A graduate of Columbia University, Gus and Frances, his wife of 35 years, came to Florida many years ago and quickly became active in the community while raising their children, Ellen, Paul, and Mark. Whether you mention business associations, cultural events, transportation problems, church matters, or youth programs, Gus Stavros has contributed his time, his efforts and his leadership to help make not only his hometown and his county, but the entire Tampa Bay area a better place to live.

The Governor of Florida recognized Gus Stavros as the "Free Enterpriser of the Year" in 1982, and this award merely follows numerous other awards he has received including the prestigious "Bilgore Humanitarian Award" in 1977 and Phi Delta Kappa's "Outstanding Layman's Award" in 1979. Now the B'nai B'rith "Great American Traditions Award" again exemplifies that special character of Gus Stavros, and it is especially fitting for the B'nai B'rith to honor the son of Greek immigrants who gave him a love of life and an appreciation of his fellow man.

I am fortunate to have been asked to serve as this year's honorary chairman of the banquet honoring Gus Stavros, but I am even more honored to have met Gus more than 20 years ago and to enjoy his friendship. Gus Stavros is a most dedicated and outstanding citizen. He is truly worthy of this year's award, and as I congratulate Gus and thank him for his many contributions to our community, our State, and our Nation, I also commend the B'nai B'rith for honoring this man who represents what is good about America.●

LAX ENFORCEMENT OF BAN ON RESALE PRICE FIXING OPPOSED

HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1983

● Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, I have been a persistent critic of this administration's lax enforcement of the anti-

trust prohibition on resale price maintenance. The practice whereby a manufacturer tries to dictate the price at which the retailer resells to consumers is per se illegal under longstanding Supreme Court decision. Nevertheless, both the Assistant Attorney General for Antitrust and the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission have openly disavowed the Court's rulings and said they will modify enforcement to suit their own, relaxed view of what the law should be. The result is that in difficult economic times we are seeing consumers increasingly deprived of the discounts and bargains many have relied upon to make ends meet.

Understandably, more and more Members of Congress are concerned about this issue. As the chairman of the subcommittee with jurisdiction over the FTC, I have received an increasing number of inquiries from colleagues. Accordingly, I am here inserting in the RECORD an article describing the controversy over resale price maintenance.

Additionally, I have introduced today a resolution urging the administration to enforce the law. I note that this is not a partisan issue. The resolution I have introduced is similar to that of the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, Senator RUDMAN, sponsored by Senators of both parties.

I urge all of my colleagues to join in sponsoring this resolution, the text of which is printed here:

H.J. RES. 389

Joint resolution calling upon the Federal Trade Commission, Department of Justice, and all other appropriate Federal agencies to enforce the Federal Trade Commission Act, the Sherman Act, and all other Federal antitrust laws including the prohibition against vertical price restraints

Whereas the Congress in 1914 enacted the Federal Trade Commission Act to prohibit "unfair methods of competition";

Whereas the Congress in 1890 enacted the Sherman Act to prohibit "Every contract, combination in the form of trust or otherwise, or conspiracy, in restraint of trade or commerce among the several States or with foreign nations . . .";

Whereas the United States Supreme Court has consistently held that vertical price restraints are per se violations of the antitrust laws, including the Federal Trade Commission Act;

Whereas the Congress upheld the Supreme Court's interpretation of the antitrust laws prohibiting vertical price restrictions when in 1975 portions of the Miller-Tydings Act and the McGuire Act authorizing State laws permitting "fair-trade" restrictions were repealed;

Whereas consumers benefit from vigorous price competition at the retail level and are hurt by vertical price-fixing conspiracies which raise consumer prices and infringe upon retailers' rights to free trade;

Whereas the Federal Trade Commission and the United States Attorney General are charged with instituting proceedings to prevent and restrain violations of the antitrust laws;

Whereas the Federal Trade Commission and the United States Attorney General, in contravention of their responsibilities for enforcing the antitrust laws, are not actively enforcing the law regarding vertical price restraints; and

Whereas the Solicitor General of the United States Department of Justice, on behalf of the United States, has filed an amicus curiae brief with the Supreme Court which, in part, advocates weakening the law regarding vertical price restraints: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Federal Trade Commission, the United States Attorney General, and all other appropriate Federal agencies and officials shall faithfully and vigorously enforce the Federal Trade Commission Act, the Sherman Act, and all other Federal antitrust laws, including the prohibition against vertical price restraints, and shall cease propounding arguments in court designed to weaken the law prohibiting vertical price restraints. To the extent that the Federal Trade Commission, the Attorney General, or other Federal agencies and officials shall deem it necessary to change the law prohibiting vertical price restraints, such agencies and officials shall forward proposed legislation embodying such changes to the Congress for proper consideration.

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 21, 1983]

DISCOUNTERS, ALLEGING PRICE-FIXING, ARE FIGHTING CUTS IN THEIR SUPPLIES
(By Claudia Ricci)

Not long ago, an eager bargain hunter could buy a Pioneer stereo receiver through a catalog showroom and save a good \$100. But no more. Last June Pioneer cut off distribution to all catalog showrooms, saying it wanted to thin out dealer ranks.

"Our product was over-distributed," explains Jack Doyle, president of Pioneer Electronics (USA) Inc. "When you have product in too many places, it doesn't have much value to anybody," he adds.

Nonsense, say some discounters; Pioneer just wanted to get rid of the price choppers. "The end result is that consumers pay more" for Pioneer equipment, says Tracy Mandart, president of H. J. Wilson Co., a large catalog showroom dealer.

Many manufacturers besides Pioneer have choked off supplies to discounters in recent months, and the discounters are fighting back. They say cutting off a discount store constitutes price-fixing, violates antitrust laws, threatens the discount industry and will force millions of consumers to pay higher prices in full-price stores. They blame the cut-off trend on Reagan administration officials who take the position that price-fixing isn't always harmful.

Earlier this year, several retailers and their trade groups started a Washington lobbying campaign to fight price-fixing. This prompted some recent demands from members of Congress that the Federal Trade Commission and the Justice Department enforce the law against "vertical" price-fixing, in which manufacturers impose the price that retailers must charge for their merchandise. Burlington Coat Factory, a New Jersey retailer, even organized a shopper write-in last fall. It deluged Congress with half a million angry postcards opposing price-fixing. Now Burlington plans to ask customers to write to the White House.

A REAL CONSUMER ISSUE

Several large retailers, including K mart Corp. and Dayton-Hudson Corp.'s Target discount chain, sent representatives to the White House in March to argue that the Justice Department's position is anti-consumer. "There's no doubt prices would go up" if the department gets its way, says Robert Stevenson, a K mart vice president. "We've told the White House it's a real consumer issue."

Some discounters especially assail William F. Baxter, the Justice Department's antitrust chief. Appointed two years ago, he initiated fewer antitrust cases than his predecessors. Wary of government interference in business, he thinks that many practices commonly thought to restrict competition don't really do so.

Among other things, the official questions a 1911 Supreme Court ruling that automatically makes it illegal for manufacturers to dictate the prices retailers must charge for their products. Mr. Baxter thinks this practice, called resale price maintenance as well as vertical price-fixing, doesn't always reduce competition, may actually benefit consumers and should be judged on a case-by-case basis.

If manufacturers aren't free to stop discounting, some full-price retailers will be forced to drop their products or to reduce the service and technical advice they offer consumers, Mr. Baxter believes. He thinks customers often take up the time of sales clerks in full-service stores, then buy the product from discounters, giving discounters a free ride at the cost of full-service stores. James Miller, chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, which is also supposed to police price-fixing, generally shares Mr. Baxter's views on vertical price-fixing.

With Mr. Baxter's direction, the Justice Department is trying to persuade the Supreme Court to relax its long-held opposition to vertical price-fixing. The department's brief, siding with Monsanto Co. in a high court case scheduled to be heard this fall, argues that vertical price maintenance should be judged case-by-case according to whether it would unreasonably restrict competition.

In a federal court case in California, the department is seeking a ruling favorable to a manufacturer, Apple Computer Inc., being sued by six discounters. Apple says it stopped supplying the discounters, all California computer dealers who sell through mail-order channels, in order to limit distribution to dealers who provide face-to-face service.

Apple attorney David Kopf says the computer maker didn't cut off a class of merchants, but "a type of dealing" that isn't particularly consumer-oriented. "I think mail-order is a quick way to get the wrong product," says Mr. Kopf, adding that computer buyers need guidance in selecting a unit. Cutting off mail-order dealers wasn't price-fixing "either directly or in disguise," he says. "We view face-to-face service as essential." And now that the company has cut off mail-order, he says, "we're much more happy with the service being provided to our customers."

But the discounters charge in the suit that Apple acted to satisfy full-price dealers who complained about discounters. They charge Apple with conspiring with dealers to manipulate the price of Apple products. Apple denies the charges.

"What really upsets us is that the U.S. government is taking sides" with Apple, says Francis Ravel, president of Olympic Sales

Co., one of the six plaintiffs. "Their job is to enforce the present laws. Why don't they do it?"

Mr. Ravel wrote to all 100 U.S. senators accusing Mr. Baxter of protecting large companies. "Big business has all the rights and small business has no rights at all, except the right . . . to go broke," he said.

One of Mr. Baxter's assistants says the Justice Department isn't taking sides in the Apple case and "has absolutely no interest in whether Apple wins or loses." The department is simply suggesting to the court a legal and economic framework for deciding antitrust issues raised by the case, he says.

But discounters are skeptical, and they especially question Mr. Baxter's argument that consumers need more services. "Tell me what kind of service is required in buying a piece of Lenox giftware," says Everett Purdy, senior vice president of Service Merchandise Co., a large, catalog-showroom retailer. Until last fall, the Service Merchandise catalog offered Lenox china. But the supply dried up after Lenox won FTC permission to stop its authorized dealers from "transshipping," the product to discounters.

CONTROL OF AN IMAGE

Transshipping, in which discounters buy their merchandise from authorized dealers with overstock instead of from manufacturers, raises another issue in the discount pricing fight. "We don't terminate anybody for discounting," says Stephen F. Lichtenstein, secretary of Lenox Inc. But transshipping to unauthorized price-cutters "takes away control of our image," he adds.

"Our authorized dealers have magnificent displays, and they have people who are trained" to discuss fine china, Mr. Lichtenstein says. Several other manufacturers have sought FTC permission to stop their dealers from transshipping.

While discounters complain most about Mr. Baxter and the Justice Department, they also gripe about FTC policies. Lately the number of new price-fixing cases initiated by the agency has fallen sharply, and critics say manufacturers are taking this as a signal to fix prices.

"The rhetoric is that 'you may go out and engage in vertical price restraint because we don't think there's anything wrong with it,'" says Benjamin Sharp, a Washington lawyer who served in the FTC's Bureau of Competition until last year. "I have some real problems with that."

Tim Muris, who now heads that FTC bureau, says that a 1977 Supreme Court ruling left a big "gray area" in price-fixing law that makes the agency more cautious about taking action against manufacturers. "We will bring vertical cases," but the agency wants to avoid "knee-jerk reactions" to charges that retailers have fallen victim to price-fixing, the official adds.

Many members of Congress find this approach alarming. In recent weeks, 27 senators have sponsored a resolution demanding that the Justice Department and the FTC enforce the price-fixing law and seek changes only through Congress. Last month, the House Judiciary Committee approved a funding measure that would bar the Justice Department from engaging in court cases to argue for relaxing the ban on price-fixing. Two senators, Republican Warren Rudman of New Hampshire and Democrat Howard Metzenbaum of Ohio, are preparing a brief opposing the Justice Department's position in the Monsanto case.

But this doesn't do much to ease the retailers' immediate worry: how to handle threats from suppliers who threaten to cut them off if they don't raise prices. "We have felt pressure we didn't feel before," says Robert Cole, attorney for Sportmart, a chain of sporting-goods stores in Chicago and Los Angeles. Once, the FTC might have been called in on manufacturer demands to raise prices, he adds. "But the FTC really isn't a help anymore."●

UNITED STATES-CHINA RELATIONS MUST MAINTAIN NEW MOMENTUM

HON. AL SWIFT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1983

● Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Speaker, our relationship with the People's Republic of China has reached a critical juncture. Following several years of arms-length talks and uncertainty about the level of commitment each nation would bring to a fuller relationship, recent developments point toward a renewed spirit of cooperation.

The administration, under prodding by key figures like Secretary of Commerce Malcolm Baldrige, is developing a new, more liberal policy on the transfer of U.S. technologies to China. The implementation and fulfillment of this new policy will support Chinese economic development and allow U.S. firms to compete on a more equal basis to supply China's needs. We, in the Congress, must help to insure that this and other promising initiatives for stronger economic and commercial links with China will blossom and bear fruit.

The Chinese Government, although cautious, seems also to be extending its hand to secure improved economic and commercial ties with the United States. One of the most interesting summaries of how the Chinese view the developing ties with the United States was published as a supplementary insert in the New York Times on October 3, 1983. China's Ambassador to the United States, Zhang Wenjin, described the promises and challenges involved in closer ties between our two countries.

Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that the people of our Nation understand that the United States is on the verge of developing important new links with China, a nation that represents about one-third of all the people on Earth. It is important that our people, particularly those involved in businesses, obtain as much information as possible about China and her people. As chairman of the Special Subcommittee on U.S. Trade with China, I am committed to increasing communication between our two nations and reducing barriers for commercial and economic relations.

Following is the statement of Ambassador Zhang:

[From the New York Times, Oct. 3, 1983]

SINO-U.S. RELATIONS: PROMISES AND CHALLENGES

Since the founding of the People's Republic of China in 1949, great progress in all fields has been achieved. Now, there exists a favourable political situation of stability and unity. The living standards of our one billion people have been substantially improved. The gross industrial and agricultural output in 1982 surpassed the 4 percent annual growth rate set for the present Sixth Five-Year Plan. The whole nation has embarked on a modernization drive—modernization in industry, agriculture, science and technology, and national defense—and strives to quadruple the gross annual industrial and agricultural output value by the end of this century.

Externally, China adheres to an independent foreign policy, taking opposition to hegemonism and safeguarding world peace as the basic points of departure. China attaches great importance to Sino-U.S. relations, believing that the development of these relations is not only in the fundamental interests of both our peoples but also conducive to world peace and stability. Therefore, China stands for establishing, enduring and stable relations with the United States on the basis of the Joint Communiqué of January 1, 1979 on the establishment of diplomatic relations and the August Communiqué of 1982. In recent years, a series of agreements, accords and protocols have been signed between the two governments, covering various aspects of our relations. Multiplication of exchanges in various fields has contributed to the friendship and well-being of both peoples. Thousands of Chinese scholars and students are here on American campuses. Numerous visitors come and go, ignoring the vast distance posed by the Pacific Ocean. In the economic field, China pursues a policy of opening to the outside world, which has brought a substantial increase in trade between our two countries. Chinese and American companies have in recent years signed more than 100 contracts and agreements. The two-way trade turnover in 1982 topped \$5 billion, which is almost six times that of 1978. As China is setting out to revamp its enterprises and strengthen its energy, mineral, transport and communication and other sectors of the national economy, we can find more sectors for further cooperation.

However, it must be pointed out that there still remain certain obstacles to the development of Sino-U.S. relations, the chief one being the Taiwan question. Our principled position is that there should be no infringement on China's sovereignty and no interference in China's internal affairs. We hope that the existing obstacles will be cleared away one after another so that broader vistas will be opened for a constructive relationship.●

GREATER PITTSBURGH AMBULANCE ASSOCIATION OBSERVES 30TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. FRANK HARRISON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1983

● Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday evening, October 22, the Greater Pittston area will celebrate a significant event. The Greater Pittston Ambulance Association will observe its 30th anniversary with a dinner-dance. At that time, the association will pay special tribute to its past president, Frank C. Castellino, who also serves as the recorder of deeds of Luzerne County.

There is no question that the Greater Pittston Ambulance Association is one of the most active in all of the Wyoming Valley. In 1979, it had 1,200 runs and with each passing year, the number has either remained the same or actually increased.

The association has raised funds to purchase the most modern of medical equipment. As a community service, it distributes vials of life to senior citizens. It takes part in fire drills at schools and multiunit apartment buildings.

In 1982 a paging system was put into service enhancing the ability of calling volunteers to man the ambulance. Cooperative understanding was reached with nearby communities whereby each is a standby for the other should two calls occur at the same time.

Currently, the association is comprised of 34 attendants. Of these, 3 are paramedics, 9 are EMT's, 20 hold current first aid and CPR cards, 2 are enrolled in EMT classes and 3 of the EMT's have had other medical training.

The officers of the association are James Ruane, president; Frank Roman III, vice president; Louis Calabrese, treasurer; Susan Monk, secretary; James Rooney, captain, and Bill Williams, Herry Walsh, and Susan Monk, cocaptains.

For all of these community volunteers and, in particular, for Past President Castellino, next Saturday's celebration will be a well-deserved reflection of hard work and significant achievement for the community. And that spirit of voluntarism is, of course, Mr. Speaker, what has made America great over the past two centuries.

And so it is my pleasure to join in paying tribute to the greater Pittston Ambulance Association on its 30th anniversary, acknowledging the tireless efforts of its volunteer officers and members and of according special recognition to Recorder of Deeds Frank C. Castellino as he is honored by his colleagues for so many years of community service.●

THE RESIGNATION OF JAMES WATT

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1983

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, October 19, 1983 into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE RESIGNATION OF JAMES WATT

On Sunday, October 9, James Watt submitted his resignation to Ronald Reagan. The President accepted it with reluctance, thereby ending the term of one of the most controversial secretaries in the 134-year history of the Department of the Interior. To most observers, the resignation came as no surprise. Faced with mounting pressure from the public at large, open speculation in the media as to his replacement, and a resolution of no confidence pending in the Senate, Mr. Watt chose the reasonable course and stepped aside.

Hoosiers do not generally focus on the Department of the Interior, but its secretary has a very important job. He manages an annual budget of \$6 billion, controls over 500 million acres of federal land, and has trust responsibility for some 50 million acres of Indian land. He guides the conservation and development of mineral and water resources, the conservation, development, and utilization of fish and wildlife resources, and the coordination of federal and state recreation programs. He oversees the preservation of scenic and historic areas, operates employment programs for young people, and reclaims arid land in the western states. He administers necessary services for native Americans, hydroelectric power systems, and the social and economic development of American territories. It is no exaggeration to say that Mr. Watt wielded great power.

A barrage of justifiable criticism has been levelled at Mr. Watt, but it should be pointed out that he displayed some positive traits during his tenure in office. Mr. Watt was a very vigorous man (a "mover and shaker" in Washington terms) with a clear vision of his goal as secretary. His energy and single-mindedness enabled him to drive a large bureaucracy. He knew the intricacies of that bureaucracy as well as any of his fellow cabinet officers knew the intricacies of theirs, and, recognizing that his secretaryship was no "one-man show", he skillfully surrounded himself with supportive appointees who were capable of translating his philosophy into action. Mr. Watt understood and used mining interests and land developers, two strong political constituencies, to his advantage. He enjoyed a close relationship with his boss. Mr. Watt was loyal to the President, and Mr. Reagan trusted him.

There can be little doubt that Mr. Watt's propensity for misstatement got him into trouble and eventually cost him his job. Just a few words were enough to topple him in the end, but the bad feeling caused by his loose talk had been building for more than two years. Among other things, Mr. Watt had called for a "Christian revolution," impugned the patriotism of liberals, and spoken of Indian reservations as failed experiments in socialism. It was the reaction to his description of the people on his own coal leasing advisory commission that finally tipped the scales against him. Mr. Watt joked that he had "a black, a woman, two

Jews, and a cripple—and talent" on the commission. His crude attempt at humor deeply embarrassed the President. A prominent Republican Senator complained that "we just can't stand every two or three months Mr. Watt's making some comment to offend another 20 or 30 or 40 million people." His ill-considered remarks had offended too many sizeable portions of the electorate too often.

Perhaps Mr. Watt's personal style was a more fundamental cause of his demise. I think that his combative ways worked very much against him. He had an appetite for controversy, a penchant for confrontation, and an inability to resist a fight. Mr. Watt never placated Congress, nor did he build bridges to important political constituencies. He simply plunged ahead, making enemies unnecessarily time and again. His appearances before committees of Congress, for example, frequently became verbal "shootouts". With more than a touch of arrogance, Mr. Watt would present his testimony and argue his position as if he were engaged in a religious crusade. He would attribute all sorts of unsavory motives to his opponents, claiming, for instance, that they favored social engineering. I never saw Mr. Watt soft-pedal his views. Indeed, he always impressed me as a man who would rather lose a "whole loaf" for ideological reasons than win "half a loaf" through compromise.

The most fundamental cause of Mr. Watt's difficulty was the substance of his policies. The agenda that he pursued was radical in the sense that it departed markedly from the agendas pursued by previous secretaries, both Republican and Democrat. Rather than following his predecessors by making an effort to balance environmental and development interests, Mr. Watt aggressively pushed development. For example, he opened up the entire outer continental shelf for oil and gas leasing and allowed industry to choose tracts. He greatly accelerated the leasing of federal coal, geothermal, and on-shore oil and gas property despite recession in the energy market. He revoked many restrictions in order to free up more federal land for mining. He sharply boosted sales of federal land to private interests. He stopped buying land for national parks and raised fees for visitors. He proposed less land for designation as wilderness. Many other examples could be cited to show Mr. Watt's one-sided emphasis.

Mr. Watt regarded himself as a champion of development, whose mission was to turn back a rising tide of environmental regulation. When Mr. Reagan was elected to office, there did seem to be a consensus in the nation that environmental rules should be reviewed, revised, and reformed. Mr. Watt's relentless push for development, however, shattered whatever consensus might have existed. He turned many people who had been thinking of reform—people who might have supported a more deliberate approach—into committed opponents. The environmentalists repudiated Mr. Watt from the start, but in the end almost all had had enough.

Mr. Watt's most serious error was his failure to comprehend what most Americans really want. If there has been rapid growth of environmental regulation in this country, it occurred because people place a very high premium on environmental protection and resource conservation. They also want development and the work it creates, but they believe that it is possible to strike an enduring, productive balance between the competing sets of values. Mr. Watt was not a man of balance.●

ACCOUNTING FOR AMERICANS IN SOVIET HANDS

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1983

● Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, 49 days ago, we, in the United States and the rest of the free world, were horrified by the brutal murder of those on KAL 007 by the Soviets. In the intervening time, we have watched the people in and out of Government, who refuse to learn who these murderers are, attempt to blur and argue out of existence the enormity of the crime and the stark light it throws on who the Soviets really are.

Today, I am introducing in the House a resolution which again reminds the Congress that KAL 007 is not an isolated incident but the latest in a continuing policy of contempt for the lives of anyone in the mad dash of the Soviets to rule the world. KAL 007 was not a "tragedy," nor a "mistake," nor was it a natural or understandable response by the Soviets. It was an act of war by an empire which does the same kind of thing over and over only to have the Western press and their apologists in Western governments cover up and deflect public indignation over cold-blooded murder.

My resolution sets out four similar incidents going back to the end of the Second World War; in each of them there are indications of survivors. It includes by reference a list of more than 30 such incidents, in each of which the Soviets shot down foreign aircraft and in each of which the fate of the occupants has been swallowed up by the workings of the Soviet police state and the concerted silence of the American apologists for that police state.

As of yesterday, the Soviets are still actively seeking to prevent the accumulation of the remains of KAL 007, and precise information concerning the fate of those onboard. How long can we afford to accept the misrepresentation of Soviet methods and goals for the sake of some unreal hope that the Soviets are just like everyone else. I, for one, am insulted to be compared as an American with a regime whose principal characteristic for six long decades has been its disregard for human life, human values, and the opinions of mankind.

There is no hope to build a safe world in covering up or misunderstanding the nature of the state which, in the last 40 years, has created most of the world's wars and almost all the misery it uses to stir up the Third World. The facts tell us what is it we face, and we would be ill-advised to delude ourselves about what those facts portend.

The text of my resolution follows:

H.J. RES. —

Joint Resolution instructing the Secretary of State to provide the Congress with complete information concerning the number of American nationals now held by the Soviet Union or so held at any time since the cessation of hostilities at the conclusion of World War II, and all steps taken to identify and recover such persons

Whereas the nation was shocked and enraged by the wanton murder of innocent passengers and crew of Korean Airlines Flight 007 last month, and

Whereas this is not the first time the Soviet government has shot down airplanes on the periphery of its empire, and

Whereas in the more than thirty incidents of airplanes shot down by the Soviets, there have been several in which there were verified and possible survivors, and

Whereas it is the obligation of the Soviet government to inform the government of the United States of the identity of any American national held by the Soviet government, and

Whereas there is clear evidence that the Soviet government hold and has held scores of American nationals as a result of shooting down aircraft without ever advising the United States and without admitting that it so holds American nationals,

Now therefore be it resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives in Congress assembled,

That the Secretary of State be instructed to provide the Congress with complete information concerning the number of American nationals now held by the Soviet Union or so held at any time since the cessation of hostilities at the conclusion of World War II, and

That the Secretary provide the Congress with the total record of any and all steps taken by the Department of State or by any other agency of the Government of the United States to identify and recover the persons or remains of American nationals held by the Soviet government, and

That in particular, the Secretary provide such detailed information with reference to the following incidents:

A. Baltic Incident USN Privateer—April 8, 1950—Soviets report firing on U.S. plane over Latvia near Leipaja (Libau). Crew: Howard C. Seeschaf, 264095; John Fette, 320676; Robert Reynolds, 368573; Tommy Burgess, 506762; Joe Henry Danens, 368438; Jack Thomas, 224750; Frank Beckman, 2799076; Edward Pureili, 2540438; Joseph Rinniar, 2542600; and Joseph Bourassa, 9539864.

B. Kamchatka Incident, USAF—B-29, June 13, 1952—Soviets report firing on B-29 which was downed over Kamchatka peninsula or the Sea of Japan.

The missing personnel and their serial numbers from the B-29 are: Samuel Busch, 733811; James Scully, 693414; Samuel Service, 752509; Robert McDonnell, 2222264; William Homer, 7025704; David Moore, 15229915; William Blizzard, 19244175; Miguel Monserrat, 13164064; Eddie Berg, 17281746; Leon Bonura, 18359162; Roscoe Becker, 19391813; and Danny Pillsbury, 18245964.

C. Kamchatka peninsula, Sea of Japan, incident USAF B-50—July 29, 1953—Soviets report Soviet fighters fired at B-50 for violating Soviet borders over Gamona and Askold Island near Vladivostok. They say the craft disappeared. One crewman was saved by an American destroyer. He saw

crewmates being picked up by Soviet ships; 16 airmen are missing.

D. Armenian incident—USAF C-130. Soviets report USAF Transport shot down in Armenia. Six bodies have been returned to the U.S. Eleven others unaccounted for. U.S.S.R. magazine "Ogoniok" citing article in E. German publication reports eleven crew members of C-130 parachuted safely and were captured. U.S.S.R. later denies report.

And

That, the Secretary include in his report, all information available with reference to those instances set forth in the Congressional Record of September 14, 1983, on pages 23988 and 23989.

INDUSTRIAL POLICY: OUR FUTURE ERROR

HON. NORMAN D. SHUMWAY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1983

● Mr. SHUMWAY. Mr. Speaker, although the idea that our economic performance can be improved by adopting industrial policy is currently getting a good deal of attention, it turns out that most economists are quite skeptical of both the premises underlying the concept and specific proposals.

Writing in the Los Angeles Times, George Perry of Brookings explains the situation clearly:

The idea that there are imperfections in markets holds out the possibility that government action to offset these imperfections could improve national income and aid growth. But . . . a random outcome is the best one could expect. And a random over-riding of the market would clearly reduce national income.

Perry concludes by stating flatly that "industrial policy would be a mistake," an assertion that I quite agree with.

The full text of Perry's article follows:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Sept. 27, 1983]

INDUSTRIAL POLICY: OUR FUTURE ERROR (By George L. Perry)

I recently participated in a conference sponsored by the Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City on the general subject of "Industrial Change and Public Policy." All the sessions at the conference, papers from which will be published by the bank, directly or indirectly addressed the need for an "industrial policy" in this country.

This is the catchall name for policies that would target direct government assistance to selected industries, principally through old-fashioned protection from foreign competition or new-fashioned investment subsidies for selected industries. The interest in such programs grows out of the hard times experienced by many industries at present and in the recent past. Such proposals are increasingly popular in Washington and in the business and labor communities and are likely to be a focal point of the political debate in the coming election year.

Proponents of industrial policy base their case on some or all of the following proposi-

tions: American industry is suffering from unfair competition from abroad, and for this, and possibly other reasons, American industry is losing its ability to compete in industrial products generally. There are projects and industries that are not adequately supported by the private market system but that promise large returns to investment in the long run. The right firms and industries can be identified for support by government programs.

ECONOMISTS GENERALLY OPPOSED

The reaction of the economists at the conference to the industrial policy proposals ranged from cautious (a few) to skeptical (a few more) to clearly opposed (the great majority). And it is instructive to see why this is so when these ideas are so popular in other circles. It seems to me that there are three main reasons: One is an interpretation of the present plight of American industries and the other two are based on the economists' distinctive perspective on the economy.

First, economists recognize that much of the severe recession confronting the industrial heartland of America stems from the fiscal and monetary policies that have been pursued for the last few years and that are in place today. To deal with these problems, they advocate changes in budget and monetary policies that would reduce budget deficits, lower interest rates, stimulate world expansion and return the foreign exchange value of the dollar to a more competitive level. With these macroeconomic corrections in place, remaining industrial changes would reflect desirable long-run trends in what this country produces and sells and what it buys, from others.

Second, unless they are employed by or otherwise cater to some special interest, economists evaluate policies by their effect on the general interest. Industrial policies, by their nature and intent, target industries for special assistance. The benefits to the assisted sector are clear to everyone. The costs to the economy in general, and therefore to the population as a whole, are diffuse and less visible. But they are what economists look for and what others miss.

Third, and relatedly, economists are trained to think about economic efficiency—how labor and capital should be allocated to produce the highest levels of national output and income. Except under very special circumstances, policies that override market forces for the purpose of diverting capital and labor from one industry to another reduce national income and therefore the general good.

Advocates of an industrial policy sometimes acknowledge the general propositions that I have just described but argue that they apply only to abstract models of the world. But the economists at the conference were not naive on such matters. They were extremely able, including two Nobel Prize winners and some of the brightest young stars of the profession. They were not doctrinaire, free-market extremists. All had a professional interest in policy issues, and most had Washington experience.

By and large they operated within an analytic framework that recognized that the world is imperfect. But they doubted our ability to improve efficiency through protection or subsidies. And they recognized that government programs to target assistance of either sort would be governed by politics, not economics. The general feeling was not simply that such programs would not help, but that they would do real harm.

DIFFICULT TO IMPLEMENT

Paul Krugman's paper for the conference specifically analyzed the criteria that advocates of industrial policy have proposed for selecting industries to target for support. He showed that none of them are promising or easy to implement and that two popular criteria—choosing those industries that have high value-added per worker and industries that are targeted by governments in other countries—would be clearly counterproductive.

Industries with high value-added per worker generally have a high ratio of capital per worker (or employ exceptionally skilled labor). Oil refining and chemicals are prime examples. Diverting capital to them from elsewhere would reduce total employment and total output and income. Krugman points out that just this kind of targeting strategy contributed to the failed development plans in many less developed countries.

Industries that have been targeted by other countries already suffer from overproduction and excess capacity, steel and wheat being two examples. The return to investment in these industries is thus already low. Krugman observes that subsidizing them further in this country would only produce a still lower social return to investment—the opposite of the argument for targeting—and lead to still greater excess capacity.

The idea that there are imperfections in markets holds out the possibility that government action to offset these imperfections could improve national income and aid growth. But the possibility of actually finding the right places to intervene is low. And the thought that a government program would find the right places is implausible. A random outcome is the best one could expect. And a random overriding of the market would clearly reduce national income. Industrial policy would be a mistake. But since only economists seem to realize it, it may be in our future.●

VISIT TO HAZLETON, PA., BY
KENNETH B. CANTOLI, GRAND
EXALTED RULER, ELKS

HON. FRANK HARRISON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1983

● Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, October 22, the Hazleton Lodge of Elks will be honored by a visit from Kenneth B. Cantoli, the Grand Exalted Ruler of all 1,600,000 Elks nationwide.

Mr. Cantoli is a lifelong resident of New Jersey, who has compiled a record of outstanding and unselfish service to the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks. He has been a district and national officer of the ritualistic committee and of the auditing and business practices committee. He has served as a member of the board of grand trustees and as vice chairman of that board.

He holds a BA degree in accounting from Upsala College and a doctorate of law from Seton Hall University. Prior to entering his own tax accounting practice, Mr. Cantoli served as a

Federal Treasury agent. He is married to the former Ruth Rogers and their marriage has been blessed with three children and three grandchildren.

The visit of the Grand Exalted Ruler to Hazleton, Mr. Speaker, affords me an opportunity to reflect on all the good work which the Hazleton Lodge of Elks has performed over the years. It has been active in all facets of the community life to the "Mountain City," and has, indeed, proved that charity is the cornerstone of Elksdom.

And so on this occasion it is my pleasure to join with my friends in the Hazleton Lodge of Elks in welcoming their Grand Exalted Ruler to the city of Hazleton and in northeastern Pennsylvania. I look forward to joining them for a dinner of celebration that evening and am happy to have had this opportunity to share this happy occasion with my friends and colleagues in the House.●

THE MULTIDIMENSIONAL
SOVIET THREAT TO PEACE

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1983

● Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I wish all Americans had an opportunity to take a look at the front page of yesterday's Washington Post because three articles appear there which clearly show the many different ways the Soviets continue to threaten the balance of world peace.

The Post continued yesterday its week-long series entitled "Afghanistan—Inside a Soviet War Zone." The article details Soviet activities inside a nation that has been occupied by Soviet troops since its military invasion of Afghanistan 4 years ago.

Another story reveals that an American has been charged with selling classified national security documents to Polish agents who were acting as surrogates for the Soviet KGB.

Finally, in a third story the Post quotes a high-ranking Soviet general who admits for the first time that Soviet nuclear missiles are already deployed in Eastern Europe and that the Soviets are contemplating positioning nuclear missiles within 10 minutes of targets in the United States.

Perhaps accounts of Soviet aggression, spying and nuclear armament have become too commonplace to draw attention from the American public. However, the evidence is there for all the world to see that it is the Soviet Union, and not the United States, which poses a multidimensional threat to world peace and public awareness is one of the most important weapons we have to combat this Soviet threat.●

LEGISLATION TO REFORM THE
FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT
COMPENSATION PROGRAMS

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1983

● Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation today to make major reforms in the Federal unemployment compensation programs. Specifically, my legislation would liberalize entitlement to extended benefits (EB), extend the Federal supplemental compensation (FSC) program for 18 months, and make two minor amendments to current law dealing with the treatment of unemployed individuals.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues know the recent action by the Congress to extend the current FSC program until October 18. It is doubtful that the Ways and Means-Finance conference will be able to agree on a compromise between the two dramatically different bills by then; it may be that we will vote again on a short extension of the current program. The administration has requested an 18-month extension; the Ways and Means Committee initially proposed a 9-month extension. Neither proposal, however, addresses the fundamental problems with unemployment compensation programs in general.

There are currently two Federal programs which provide extended unemployment compensation to individuals who are out of work, after they exhaust their entitlement to state unemployment compensation: Extended benefits (EB) and FSC. My legislation addresses both areas.

Under present law, an individual who has exhausted his State unemployment benefits is allowed to collect an additional 13 weeks of EB if his State is "triggered on" the program. The EB program is paid for one-half out of Federal revenues and one-half out of the State unemployment trust fund. A State is "triggered on" the EB program if either of the following is true: First, the insured unemployment rate (IUR) is 6 percent, or, second, the IUR is 5 percent, and is 20 percent higher than the same 13-week period the year before.

At the present time, only two States pay extended benefits.

There are, however, many problems with the so-called EB trigger. One major problem is the fact that as a recession worsens, many States begin to trigger off the program, as evidenced by the fact that only two States are currently paying EB.

Entitlement to EB is based on a State's insured unemployment rate (IUR), which is the fraction representing the number of individuals in a

State claiming State benefits divided by the number of individuals working in jobs in the State which are covered by the unemployment program. Thus, if a State has 25,000 claimants for State benefits and 500,000 employees statewide, the IUR in the State would be 5 percent. Unfortunately, as a recession worsens, individuals begin to exhaust their entitlement to State benefits and the numerator in the fraction becomes smaller, thus lowering the IUR—even though many individuals remain unemployed. In a prolonged recession, the IUR is an inaccurate measure of a State's unemployment rate.

Prior to 1981—specifically, prior to passage of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981—the numerator in the fraction included recipients of EB, thus extending the time before which a State could trigger off EB. Returning to the prereconciliation rules, however, does not seem desirable, as a State could have difficulty triggering off EB.

My legislation addresses both problems. It would amend the formula for determining entitlement for EB by linking payments to a new base average unemployment rate (BAUR), which would be the combined total of the IUR and total unemployment rate (TUR) divided by 2. For example, if a State's IUR were 3.5 percent and its TUR were 6.2 percent, its BAUR for purposes of determining eligibility for EB would be 4.85 percent.

As well, the triggers for determining eligibility for EB would be amended to the following: First, the BAUR would have to equal 5.5 percent, or, second, the BAUR would have to equal 4.5 percent and be 30 percent higher than the equivalent 13-week period in the previous year.

My legislation would also address the possibility of using sub-State triggers to determine eligibility for extended benefits. This would be done because a State may have an overall low unemployment rate with pockets of unemployment that greatly exceed the lower State level. Under my legislation, the Department of Labor would be required to compile unemployment statistics—both the IUR and TUR—on unemployment in counties. The report would have to be completed within 6 months of enactment. After this report is completed, the BAUR of each county would be calculated, and EB would be paid in those counties that meet the new EB criteria. As a general rule, an individual would be eligible for EB if the county in which he or she last worked met or exceeded the EB triggers.

My legislation would also extend the FSC program, which expires on October 18 of this year. Under the bill, the FSC program would be extended to February 28, 1985. Benefits would be paid as follows: First, 14 weeks in

States with 9 percent BAUR or above; second, 12 weeks in States with a BAUR of 8-8.99 percent; third, 10 weeks in States with a BAUR of 7-7.99 percent; fourth, 8 weeks in States with a BAUR of 6-6.99 percent; and fifth, 6 weeks in all other States.

Unlike the legislation proposed by the administration, however, my bill contains a "reachback" provision, so that individuals who had exhausted entitlement to FSC on or before October 18 could receive additional weeks of benefits, up to a maximum of 6 weeks. Under the rules in my bill, individuals who have entitlement to FSC remaining, or have exhausted all entitlement, could receive additional weeks of benefits up to one-half of their new FSC entitlement. In no event, however, could an individual who had entitlement remaining receive more weeks of FSC benefits after October 18 than the maximum number of basic weeks of FSC payable in the State as of that date.

My legislation also contains a guarantee against benefit reductions. Under the legislation, the maximum number of basic FSC weeks payable in a State will not be reduced more frequently than every 3 months, and will not be reduced more than 2 weeks in any 3-month period. Qualified unemployed workers will continue to be eligible for at least the number of FSC weeks to which they were entitled at the time they first qualified for FSC, even though the maximum number of basic FSC weeks payable in the State decrease because of a reduction in the State's BAUR.

As well, the FSC program would trigger on again when the national BAUR exceeded 7 percent. The Department of Labor would calculate this figure monthly after March 1, 1985, and the program would last until 3 weeks after the national BAUR dropped below 7 percent.

Finally, my legislation makes two minor amendments to current law. First, it allows an individual to withdraw money from his or her individual retirement account (IRA) before age 59½ if the individual has, in the preceding 12-month period, exhausted all rights to State and Federal unemployment compensation. Under present law, an individual generally is subject to a penalty tax equal to 10 percent of any distribution from an IRA. This provision is identical to a Senate provision in the recently enacted Social Security Amendments of 1983, that was deleted in conference.

Second, my bill would allow States the option of denying unemployment compensation to nonprofessional employees of educational institutions during the months in which they are out of work. This provision would not require States to deny these benefits, as under current law.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation will be an important reform of the unemployment laws in our Nation. I plan to share it with the members of the Ways and Means Committee, and hope that they will consider my ideas as they begin consideration of a longer extension of the FSC program.●

OLYPHANT'S 125TH ANNIVERSARY OF COAL MINING

HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1983

● Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, the Borough of Olyphant in the 10th Congressional District of Pennsylvania celebrated the 125th anniversary of coal mining within that area on Saturday, October 15, 1983. The Committee of Olyphant Residents and Taxpayers, the sponsors of the celebration, deserve our recognition and our best wishes.

Coal mining was the industry that built America. The great industries of the Northeast and Midwest—steel, auto, and the like—would not have been possible without the dedicated, hard-working coal miners of years past. This native energy source provided the fuel to move America into the industrial age and beyond to our new technologies.

As the community of Olyphant gathered in the Hall of St. Michael the Archangel Church on Saturday night for this special commemoration, I want them to know that my best wishes went with them. I commend, this convocation to my colleagues that they may take note of the significance of this special event.

Mr. Speaker, every now and again an event like this reminds us of the role of a vital part of this country's history. The coal miners of Olyphant were a force that made this country into what it is today.●

PETITION REFLECTS EUROPEAN CONCERN ABOUT U.S. CENTRAL AMERICAN POLICY

HON. STEPHEN J. SOLARZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1983

● Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, we are considering this week an important measure concerning the direction of U.S. policy in Central America. One of the many arguments against continued U.S. covert assistance to those who are trying to harass or overthrow the Nicaraguan Government is that such assistance intensifies anti-Americanism throughout the hemisphere and in Europe.

A symptom of the concern our Central American policies arouse in Europe is a petition I have just received from West Berlin with 2,908 signatures calling for the United States to stop military aid to El Salvador, supplies to the contras, and military maneuvers in the Caribbean. While both the left and the right share responsibility for the complex conflict in Central America, and while resolution of that conflict will require more than a cessation of American arms supplies, this petition is an example of how our current policies cause us problems throughout the world. Our support of the contras makes the United States sound hypocritical when we decry Soviet and Cuban activities in El Salvador and elsewhere in the world, undercutting the support we need in the hemisphere and in Europe to effectively counter communism.

Following is the text of the petition I received from the Middle-America Solidarity group in Berlin:

MITTELAMERIKA SOLIDARITÄT,
ANGELA SKOMSKE, BERLIN WEST.

August 6, 1983.

Mr. SOLARZ,
Representant of the US-Congress, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.

DEAR SIR: We have read about your activities for the sake of Central America in a Berlin-newspaper (Tagesspiegel, 19.7.83). We support your standing in the US-Congress for the stop of the military expense of El Salvador, and that no more means be granted for the antisandinistic 'Contras' in Honduras. And surely you agree with us, that all military manouvers in the caribic region must be stopped, since they are a threat for the security of Nicaragua.

We believe, the former US-minister of justice Mr. Clark is right, as he said: "when the supply of weapons would be stopped, the government of El Salvador would change within a week and the people in Nicaragua would live in peace". Behind that is the acknowledgment, that social-revolutionary movements are not a consequence of external interventions, but are developed due to the internal regimes of violence and therefore they are supported by the people. The regimes of violence indeed can only keep on existing through external military aid. If the US-government continues the military support, it tries to hinder a necessary and reasonable process by means of blood and tears.

A lot of people in Berlin West are worried, that the actual US-Central America policy expands to a conflict, which threatens peace in the world. We cannot accept that!

Mr. Solarz, please make this letter known with its signatures to all the representatives of the US-Congress and the US Senate, as well to President Reagan.

We wish you success!

MITTELAMERIKA SOLIDARITÄT.

P.S.: During the Peace Festival at the Reichstag we collected in only 6 hours the total of 2.908 signatures!●

ETHNIC DIVERSITY DAY

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1983

● Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to represent many communities of an area built by people of all races and from all backgrounds—the San Fernando Valley. I would call my colleagues' attention to a program begun in 1976, the Valley Experience, which seeks to create a greater awareness among minorities that there are broad opportunities in employment, housing, education, and recreation in the valley.

Sponsored by the Fair Housing Council of the San Fernando Valley, Valley Experience has sponsored job fairs which have attracted more than 4,000 people; the Valley Experience newspaper, with a circulation of over 1,000,000, has further spread the word about opportunities for all in the valley. And weekly tours have given inner-city residents a closeup view of the diversity that is the San Fernando Valley.

In the spirit of the mosaic of cultures that exist in the valley, the Valley Experience sponsors the fourth annual Ethnic Diversity Day, Sunday, October 30. The day celebrates the cultural contributions of many different ethnic groups in the valley. This year's theme is "Walk for Equality, Flower for Humanity."

As our Nation's cities continue to swell with people from many lands and cultures, the Valley Experience program and Cultural Diversity Day stand out as examples of the ways in which we can work together to promote greater understanding and demolish myths about suburban provincialism. I commend the Valley Experience and the San Fernando Valley Fair Housing Council for their outstanding efforts and wish them the greatest success in the future.●

SCHOOL LUNCH PILOT PROJECT ACT OF 1983

HON. OLYMPIA J. SNOWE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1983

● Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleague, Congressman McKERNAN, in introducing legislation that would restore the validity of the pilot project study of alternative means of providing commodity assistance under the national school lunch program.

In an effort to find a more efficient means of serving our agricultural community and schoolchildren, Congress mandated a study in the fiscal year

1981 Agriculture Appropriations Act instructing the Department of Agriculture to implement a pilot school lunch program in 60 school districts throughout the country. Sixty-four school districts in twenty-nine States volunteered to participate in the pilot program which calls for commodity letter of credit purchasing power or cash purchasing power to replace the present system of commodity assistance. Three school districts thus far has been very enjoyable. In fact, Maine school officials have reported cost reductions and improved efficiency in the delivery system under the pilot program compared to the traditional program. Unfortunately, citing budgetary constraints in providing cash payments to the school districts, the USDA decided in December 1982 to change the methodology in the pilot program and return to the traditional commodity donation procedures for the so-called bonus commodities that these school districts receive.

Consequently, much frustration and concern has been expressed among the school districts affected by the USDA's decision. In my home State of Maine alone, the public school districts of Portland and Bar Mills, Maine, have lost considerable funding as a result of the change in methodology used by the USDA. Moreover, the praise and support that the pilot program has received in its short duration from Maine school officials has also been flagrantly ignored by the USDA.

To correct this situation, this bill would direct the Secretary of Agriculture to continue the pilot program study through June 30, 1986, as well as provide cash compensation to those school districts that sustained losses as a result of the change in methodology. The Agriculture Department should not be allowed to renege on their commitments to those school districts, nor should we alter the legislative intent of Congress to find a more efficient means of delivering healthy food to our Nation's schoolchildren. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to join Congressman McKERNAN and I in supporting this measure.●

SERVE WITH PRIDE

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1983

● Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, it is easy, sometimes, to be discouraged about the state of our democracy, given the threats that confront us, from overseas and here at home. In such times, it is good to be reminded of the wonderful extent to which the values on which this Republic was founded live on in the younger generation. That is certainly the case with one of my con-

stituents, Mitch Gready, whose remarks before the South End Houston Optimist Club provide ample—and encouraging—evidence. I commend his remarks to my colleagues.

SERVE WITH PRIDE

Since the Declaration of Independence, Americans have always taken pride in their country and their work. But it seems these days that Americans are losing this pride. Let us take a look at the wages of pride.

Three areas in which too many Americans are no longer serving with pride are: our educational system, business, and politics.

Too many schools tend to let students who don't do the required work pass on to the next grade. As a result, when these students "graduate" from high school, they can't get a job, so they live on welfare; which in turn, makes our taxes higher. Even many of the students who go into the work force don't seem to take pride in what they're doing.

So many Americans seem to take such little pride in what they do, that we must depend heavily on foreign countries for quality products. Hitachi, Alfa Romeo, and Toyota are a few examples of such products. We depend on foreign countries for these quality products because most of the Japanese and the Europeans take pride in what they do. In the U.S., the Chrysler Unions serve as an example of American's lack of pride in their work.

The Chrysler union workers struck after the Christmas holidays. After holiday pay, they wanted increased wages without increased productivity. They were successful in their demands, and the price of Chrysler cars went up. Chrysler now cannot be as competitive. If they don't sell as many cars, layoffs result in the labor force and more people will be on welfare. As a result, our taxes go up. We pay higher prices and higher taxes because too many people want more money for less work.

Today, we can't trust many of the leaders of our country because they're more interested in the short term effect and getting re-elected than in thinking about the long-term effects of their policies. A good example of this is the Watergate scandal. Nixon lied, cheated and spied during Watergate, on the Democratic party in order to be re-elected. Most politicians are making policies that effect the long term growth and productivity of our country by calling for giveaway programs that take away people's incentive to work and produce.

Does this mean that America is lost? No. It means we must return to the ideals that made our country great and strong.

I believe that all students should be required to take four years of Economics and Political Science. That would help everybody to understand our country's economic and political systems. Also, those people who want to be mechanics, farmers, or have other vocational occupations should have the proper training from vocational schools. It would be better to train mechanics in school, rather than on our cars.

Furthermore, no student should pass any course unless he does the necessary quantity and quality of work required.

Worker's wages should be based on the productivity of the individual worker and the inflation rate. The worker's salary should not exceed the rate of inflation and the worker's productivity.

An example of Americans beginning to take pride in their work can be seen in the Ford Motor Corporation. Ford now has a

quality inspection policy. Employees inspect one another's work to achieve quality manufacturing. The result is that the public will probably get a better automobile.

When we begin to take pride in our educational system, we will begin to have better educated voters. Educated voters would be more aware of the long-term effects of the office holder's policies. Also, there should be longer terms for office holders. This would result in the office holder having to think about different constituencies, rather than one, small interest group, or just doing the things that will get him re-elected.

It is a challenge for Americans to serve with pride. We must meet this challenge by serving with the pride that made America great and will keep America great.

As an American I feel that I can serve my country with pride by taking responsibility for getting the best education I can, doing my best at every job I undertake, and being an informed voter.

Sometimes we forget the power of one person. How one person's efforts can influence other people. In fact, everything begins with one person taking action.

As Edward Everett Hale said: "I am only one, but I am one; I cannot do everything, but I can do something; What I can do, I ought to do, and what I ought to do, by the grace of God, I will do."

**KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS ASSUMPTA COUNCIL NO. 3987
HONORS REV. JOHN C. MASAKOWSKI**

HON. FRANK HARRISON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1983

● Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, on November 6, the Knights of Columbus Assumpta Council No. 3987 will be paying a very special tribute to their faithful friar, the Reverend John C. Masakowski.

Father Masakowski was born to the marriage of John and Stasia Gorney Masakowski on December 1, 1924. He was educated at Holy Trinity Grade School, Nanticoke High School and St. John Kanty College in Erie. He received a degree in philosophy from St. Mary's College, Orchard Lake, Mich., and a degree in theology from St. Cyril and Methodius Seminary, also at Orchard Lake.

Father was ordained into the Holy priesthood by the late Bishop William J. Hafey on June 4, 1949. He held a number of pastoral assignments before coming to St. John the Baptist Church, Larksville, in 1971.

One of father's greatest accomplishments was his work, together with Luzerne County Judge Bernard C. Brominski, in organizing the Assumpta Council of the Knights of Columbus in the Kingston area. He has been chaplain of the council since its inception to this day.

In honoring Father Masakowski, the Knights and Ladies of the Assumpta Council honor his magnificent career in the priesthood and, in particular,

his efforts in the formation of the council. And so this will be a very special day in Larksville, on the west side and, indeed, for all of the Wyoming Valley.

It is my pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to join in this tribute to a worthy man of God, the Reverend John C. Masakowski, in the words with which his parishioners saluted the 25th anniversary of his ordination:

Truly, with Mary, Father can acclaim, "My soul magnifies the Lord and my spirit rejoices in God my Savior" as we his parishioners, on this most important day can attest to these words as a form of congratulations.●

REAUTHORIZATION OF THE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT

HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1983

● Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, today I am proud to join with the distinguished chairman of the Education and Labor Committee, CARL D. PERKINS of Kentucky and several of my colleagues in introducing the vocational Technical Education Act of 1983, a bill to reauthorize the Vocational Education Act.

This bill will sharply focus the Federal role of assisting States to modernize secondary and postsecondary vocational programs, provide the extra services required to serve special population youth, utilize vocational education resources to train and retrain adults, and focus Federal funds on industry-education partnerships for skill development in the area of high technology. It is the result of extensive work by the American Vocational Association in cooperation with the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges and the State Directors of Vocational Education. I commend these groups for reaching out to the entire education community in the development of this legislation.

This bill contains many positive features and provides an excellent vehicle to focus congressional efforts during the reauthorization process. In discussions with one of my colleagues on the committee, TOM PETRI of Wisconsin who is also a cosponsor of this bill, we have identified several concerns which we intend to address during the legislative development of the final bill. It appears that an overly optimistic authorization figure might create a false promise to vocational educators especially given our current and projected budget deficits. As the committee acted when developing the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA), it would probably be more realistic to authorize the bill at a such sums figure which would then allow Congress to fund the

legislation at an appropriate level, balancing the critical needs that this legislation addresses against the budgetary constraints faced by Congress.

Another feature in the bill that must be addressed is the critical need to insure cooperation and coordination with the newly enacted JTPA. This is an essential element if the Federal Government is to ever launch a truly effective attack on this area of critical need in our Nation.

I look forward to the hearings on this bill because I know the committee will benefit from the perspectives of local, State, and national officials whose programs and activities will be affected by this legislation. These hearings will be crucial to the legislative process, and I intend to listen carefully to the views presented.●

A BIPARTISAN STATEMENT OF SUPPORT FOR THE UNITED NATIONS

HON. JIM LEACH

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1983

● Mr. LEACH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, recent statements by U.S. representatives to the United Nations followed by Senate approval of the Kassebaum amendment to cut U.S. assessed contributions to the United Nations have provoked a national debate in this country over the value of the United Nations to U.S. national interests and the appropriateness of maintaining the U.N. headquarters in the United States.

President Reagan responded to that debate by addressing the U.N. General Assembly on September 26, 1983, at which time he praised the United Nations "proud history of promoting conciliation and helping keep the peace," and pledged that the United States would uphold the original ideals of the United Nations. That was followed by statements from the administration in firm opposition to the Kassebaum amendment.

During recent hearings held by the Subcommittee on Human Rights and International Organizations on the U.S. role in the United Nations, a statement of support for the United Nations was submitted with the endorsement of an impressive bipartisan list of former Secretaries of State, National Security Advisers, and U.S. Representatives to the United Nations. In light of its timeliness and importance, I commend that statement to the attention of my colleagues.

THE UNITED NATIONS: A STATEMENT OF SUPPORT

The United Nations is an important instrumentality in the conduct of American foreign policy. Our experience, both in our public and private roles, has brought this home to us.

The United Nations provides this country with a forum for protecting and promoting our own interests as well as for seeking solutions to problems we share with other countries.

It is appropriate as well that this country should be the site of the United Nations, given the vision that has guided us as a nation and given the role we play, on all levels, in the world today.

We all recognize the shortcomings of the United Nations, but we live in a very imperfect and increasingly dangerous world and we must make the best use possible of whatever means we have for managing the problems that beset us.

George W. Ball, Permanent Representative to the UN—1968.

Zbigniew Brzezinski, National Security Adviser—1977-81.

McGeorge Bundy, National Security Adviser—1961-66.

Arthur J. Goldberg, Permanent Representative to the UN—1965-68.

Alexander M. Haig, Secretary of State—1981-82.

Henry A. Kissinger, Secretary of State—1973-77. National Security Adviser—1969-74.

Donald F. McHenry, Permanent Representative to the UN—1979-81.

Daniel Patrick Moynihan, Permanent Representative to the UN—1975-76.

Edmund S. Muskie, Secretary of State—1980-81.

William P. Rogers, Secretary of State—1969-73.

Dean Rusk, Secretary of State—1961-69.

John A. Scali, Permanent Representative to the UN—1973-75.

Brent Scowcroft, National Security Adviser—1975-77.

William W. Scranton, Permanent Representative to the UN—1976-77.

Cyrus R. Vance, Secretary of State—1977-80.

Andrew Young, Permanent Representative to the UN—1977-79.●

THE AMERICAN WORK FORCE IN TRANSITION

HON. STUART B. McKINNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1983

● Mr. McKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, today, the Northeast-Midwest Congressional Coalition held a conference entitled "shaping the Work Force of the Future," representing the culmination of several regional workshops conducted over the past several months in our part of the country.

Our region is leading the country in a dramatic industrial transformation that has already had profound impact. We, in Congress, are struggling to understand the nature of our industrial changes and how best to react to them. I think the coalition's conferences have dramatized the need for a renewed commitment to education and training, an investment in people, as the best means to meet the future challenge.

The luncheon speaker at today's conference was William S. Woodside, chairman and chief executive officer

of American Can Co., which has its headquarters in my district. Mr. Woodside represents the type of business leader whom this country will need in the coming decade: not only dedicated to the success of his company in new areas, but concerned with the fabric of our society and the future for our young people. He has been actively involved with the Business Roundtable, the Committee on Economic Development, and regional planning in the Greater New York area.

I would like to reprint for my colleagues the text of Mr. Woodside's speech, which outlines clearly the direction we must follow in our legislative deliberations on this topic.

THE AMERICAN WORKFORCE IN TRANSITION

(By William S. Woodside, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, American Can Co.)

Since the purpose of this conference is to focus on specific issues and direct experience rather than on elaborate theories, let me recount our experience at American Can. I think it is fairly typical of the problems faced by industrial America and the concerns we now have as a Nation.

American Can has gone through a major transformation during the last 10 to 12 years. In 1972, we were one of the traditional "Smokestack" industries like steel, rubber, and glass. We had helped support American economic growth for decades.

As our markets contracted and our plants rapidly became noncompetitive, we realized that our days as a company whose primary businesses were capital-intensive manufacturing were numbered. We could not afford the high capital cost to remain competitive in both our packaging and paper businesses. Our future—assuming there was a future—lay in consolidation, productivity improvements, and new, high growth businesses.

We reorganized and diversified. We became a company with three principal businesses: Packaging, financial services, and specialty retailing. Our first diversification was in specialty retailing, which shortly thereafter put us firmly in a fast-growing sector of the economy. The divestment of our capital-intensive paper businesses provided the capital to launch our financial services sector—now the fastest growing in that industry.

Our packaging business has been consolidated into a much more efficient operation. We have moved into specialized packaging, making metal and plastic products for targeted, higher growth markets. To achieve this, we spent nearly \$400 million in innovative, new manufacturing technology, modernizing some old packaging plants and building new ones in communities where we already were located.

These actions dramatically increased productivity and made us much more competitive. They allowed us to save jobs and maintain our contribution to the tax base in communities such as Lemoyne, Pa.; Chicago, Ill.; Hammond, Ind.; Fairport, N.Y.; and St. Paul, Minn.

We have been active on other fronts as well. In Cleveland, Ohio, we are part of an innovative public-private partnership between city officials, industry, and labor aimed at stemming capital flight, encouraging reinvestment, and thereby maintaining

and developing jobs, rather than eliminating them.

But don't be misled. The pluses and minuses do not always balance out. American Can survived as a company, but the cost was high—to us and to our employees. This has been a difficult period for everyone. Each decision was difficult. Many people were hurt. Many people still hurt. But we had only two alternatives.

We could retrench, reorganize and diversify and still maintain a competitive level of industrial capacity. Or, we could close our eyes to our projections and proceed blindly until we could no longer sustain our packaging and paper businesses. Some may find fault with the first alternative. Let me assure you—the second would have been much worse.

Could we have made better decisions? Could the impact of those decisions been less painful? Possibly. A meeting like this, with its emphasis on various responses to economic transformation, would have been a great help 12 years ago.

When we made our watershed decisions in the early 1970's, we recognized the end of an industrial cycle was upon us. But the process of transformation was largely uncharted back then. We knew other companies had been through similar experiences. But sources for reliable evaluation, information, or assistance were few and far between, more often bastions of theory than practice. There were no clearinghouses where we could learn what other people had tried, what innovative programs might be relevant, what traps to avoid, what issues we needed to consider.

True, today's economic transformation is similar in many ways to transformations of the past. However, two related factors are fundamentally different: First, the speed with which economic change is occurring, and second, its unpredictability. We once had decades to identify and solve the problems of economic change. Now cycles have been compressed into only a few years. Because we have less time, we have less room for error.

The inability to predict change often results in mind-boggling problems. For instance, the economic strategy report prepared by the Regional Plan Association for the New York-New Jersey-Connecticut area calls for the creation of an additional 500,000 job opportunities for structurally unemployed and displaced workers in the three-State area. It includes upgrading the skills of more than 200,000 now, or soon-to-be, unemployed people; a massive capital investment in water, sewage, waste disposal, transportation and energy systems; attracting more than \$6 billion in foreign investments; and expanding high technology industries.

The coalition's presence is not going to reduce the complexity or the intractability of these and other economic issues. There are limits to what any of us can achieve. This coalition does not have all the answers. Nor does anyone else.

But the presence and activities of the coalitions and the institute—the field hearings, the conferences, the background papers, the exposition—are providing us with an outlook and sense of direction that are absolutely essential for the task ahead: A dedication to finding practical solutions to specific problems; and a commitment to the people caught up in the turbulence of economic change.

If our economic problems were limited to a few isolated examples, locations, and in-

dustries, we would not need this reminder. But the scope and magnitude of these problems often leads us in a different direction. We start debating the wisdom of a national industrial policy. We analyze the high-tech revolution. We look for the big answer. We seek the one organizing concept, the one definition, the one new phrase that will provide us with a handle on our problems. I am vulnerable to this temptation as chairman of the Regional Plan Association. I suspect you are as well, when you consider the needs of an entire region of the country.

This "big picture" thinking can mislead us. It can convince us that we know more about dramatic economic and social change than we actually do, that intellectual analysis is the crucial issue, that if we can just be rigorous enough in our thinking on a theoretical level, all the practical issues will fall into place.

Yet in the last analysis, it is the "small picture" we must focus on. As a practical matter, it does not make any difference what name we give our problems or how many grand theories we design to solve them. It is the individual who must command our attention—not definitions, not concepts, not theories.

Our search for the right words and ideas often reminds me of a panel drawing that Jules Pfeiffer, the political satirist, published in the 1960's when the War on Poverty was in full force. It showed a young man. "I used to be poor," the man said in the first panel. "Then they told me I was disadvantaged," he said in the second. He was "underprivileged" in the third and "economically deprived" in the fourth. Succeeding panels contained other euphemisms. In the last panel, a sadder but wiser man said: "I still don't have a dime. But I've got a great vocabulary."

In the months ahead, you will have an opportunity to put the experience and insight you have gained as members of this coalition to important practical use. You will be asked to renew and rewrite many basic pieces of legislation that form the foundation of the Federal effort in employment, training, and education.

I work in the private sector. My perspective is somewhat different than yours. But I would like to offer a four-point framework for decisionmaking that I believe is consistent with the purpose of this conference and with the goals of this coalition.

First, our people—our human capital, if you will—must be seen as the major resource for revitalizing our economy. Economic renewal is a human problem. Technology and management ability are critical factors, but economic growth and renewal ultimately depend upon our work force. They depend on whether we, as a Nation, can provide our people with the education, training, and job opportunities that will allow them to reach their full potential and attain security in their personal lives.

Second, develop your program in stages. While developing a comprehensive view, work on those aspects of education, training, and employment where you can apply your hard-earned knowledge and experience for immediate, practical solutions. Then move on to other aspects as new needs are perceived, issues understood more clearly, and additional information and experience becomes available.

Third, find a place for the innovative and the unusual. The economic issues that bring us together involve nearly every institution in our society: State government, local government, business and industry, labor and

unions, schools, voluntary agencies, community-based organizations and the Federal Government. The exposition you have created is in itself a remarkable example of the creativity, energy and leadership available to us through these institutions. It is not enough, though, simply to encourage the innovative and the unusual. We also have to begin using these examples as models upon which to base public policy for the future.

Fourth, encourage business to become more actively involved in our public education systems. For too many years, the corporations of America have ignored the public schools. We have contributed generously to colleges and universities, but rarely thought twice about what was happening in the public elementary and secondary schools. That is beginning to change. I think one program in which American Can is deeply involved will help to illustrate.

About 1 year ago, the New York City Board of Education started a program called "Join-A-School." The idea was to involve the private sector in the problems of public education by matching up corporations that wanted to help with schools that were willing to participate. We were one of these corporations. We were matched with Martin Luther King Jr. High School in Manhattan, which, incidentally, has an exhibit at your exposition.

Join-A-School is not a complicated program. The corporation and the school are left alone to develop their own relationship. For the most part, the school sets the agenda. They tell us how they think we can help. We provide a certain amount of personnel, equipment, services, and funds.

Join-A-School is a modest program. It also is a successful one. I often urge other corporations to develop similar efforts. The corporations have resources and talents the schools can use, especially our inner-city schools; and the corporations need this type of involvement for their own sake. Almost to a person, the American Can employees who participate in Join-A-School feel more useful in the social arena than they have in years. I know several people who never thought much about social involvement—until this program came along.

From your perspective, however, the more significant point may be that Join-A-School programs could provide the basis for a relationship that will allow corporations—if invited—to work more closely with our educational systems so that public education can play a more active role in preparing people for the employment opportunities that will exist in the years ahead.

Business and the public schools have not worked well together in the past. We have both been the losers. We have failed to capitalize on many opportunities to improve our economic and educational institutions. That is why I recommended the Join-A-School program to you today. I believe it shows that the business and educational communities do not live in separate worlds, that we are part of the same community, that we share many common concerns, and that we can work together to solve problems of local and national importance in a relationship that is based on mutual respect and trust.

An additional point must be made. Our schools need more than what one corporation can provide. They need more than what all corporations can provide together. They need the full, wholehearted, unqualified support they have a right to expect from all levels of government, including the Federal Government. And this will undoubtedly

mean increased funding. I do not believe that a public-private partnership means private sector substitution for public sector responsibility. Join-A-School can supplement government support of public education. It should not be construed as a replacement for it.

Finally, permit me to restate my basic message. It is relatively simple. Let us all work to develop our legislative solutions from the bottom up. Let us find out what works in everyday life and use that as our starting point. The reality of peoples' lives must always be our guide. The plain truth is, if we cannot solve our economic and social problems on the level of the individual worker and his or her family, then we will not have solved these problems at all.

RECENT TRIAL OF YOSIF BEGUN

HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1983

● Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, the recent trial of Yosif Begun, a prominent Jewish activist seeking to emigrate to Israel, provides another glaring example of the Soviet Union's blatant disregard for the human rights of its citizens. Unfortunately, this appears to be part of a crackdown aimed at breaking the spirit of Soviet Jews who seek to fulfill their right to emigrate. At his recent trial, Begun was sentenced to 7 years of hard labor and 5 years in exile for his activities as a Soviet Jewry activist. By applying harsh sentences against the activists in the movement, the Soviets hope to set an example for other refuseniks and potential emigres.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot allow Soviet Jews to languish in the Soviet Union as their Government continually violates the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Helsinki accord, which acknowledge the right of all individuals to emigrate. Today, there has been a vigil at the Soviet Embassy in protest of the outrageous sentence given to Yosif Begun. This is precisely the kind of activity which must be continued and intensified; it must be demonstrated directly to the Soviets that their repulsive human rights policies are rejected by the American people.

I am inserting into the RECORD an article which appeared in the Washington Post on October 16. This article provides some useful insights on the Soviet Union's crackdown directed at the dissident and Soviet Jewry movement. I commend it to all people who are concerned about the disturbing trend in the Soviets' human rights policies. The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 16, 1983]

SOVIET CRACKDOWN ON DISSIDENTS SEEN

(By Dusko Doder)

Moscow, Oct. 15.—The recent arrests and trials of human rights advocates and Jewish

activists have created a deepening chill here and suggested that the authorities are mounting a new campaign to eliminate remaining stirrings of dissent.

Western diplomats say official pressure is directed not only at Jews seeking to emigrate, adherents of certain religious sects and human rights activists but also at foreigners seeking contact with them.

One of the factors undoubtedly contributing to this climate is a general Kremlin drive to tighten internal discipline. But diplomats say a related factor is the deeply strained relationship with the United States and Soviet fears that the international situation may get worse in the coming months.

Yesterday, a court in Vladimir convicted veteran Jewish dissident Josef Begun on charges of producing and distributing anti-Soviet literature and sentenced him to seven years in jail and five years of internal exile.

Begun, 51, who has been campaigning for 13 years for the right to emigrate to Israel, was given the maximum sentence under Article 70 of the criminal code. The government news agency Tass covered the trial in Vladimir, about 150 miles northeast of Moscow, and such publicity was presumably designed to warn other Jewish activists.

Dissident sources said that Begun's wife and son had been allowed into the courtroom only to hear the sentencing.

Begun, an electronics engineer, had been denied an exit visa on grounds that he had access to classified information. He already has served two periods of exile in Siberia since 1977 for "parasitism," and until his arrest last November, he was without work and earned a living by giving private Hebrew lessons.

Tass, quoting the indictment, said he had "systematically produced, spread and transferred abroad deliberately slanderous information about life in the Soviet Union on instructions from foreign subversive anticommunist centers."

[In Washington, the State Department deplored Begun's trial, saying it and other recent Soviet actions "call into question the Soviet Union's commitment to human rights."]

Earlier in the week, a Moscow court sentenced a member of an unofficial Soviet peace group to one year in jail and five years of internal exile.

Oleg Radzinsky, a 25-year-old student, was convicted Thursday on charges of spreading "during a number of years, both orally and in writing, slanderous allegations vilifying the Soviet state and social system," Tass reported.

In view of the fact that Radzinsky "deeply repented what he had done," he was treated more leniently. His trial, however, is likely to serve as a warning to other members of the unofficial peace group whose activities were embarrassing for the Kremlin.

Western reporters and diplomats were barred from both trials. The Soviet authorities refused a request by U.S. diplomats for permission to travel to Vladimir, which is an open city frequently visited by foreigners.

Diplomatic sources said that a Lithuanian Catholic priest, the Rev. Sigitas Tamkevicius, is believed to have been tried in recent days. An advocate of religious freedom, he was a founder of the Catholic Committee for the Defense of Believers' Rights.

Tamkevicius was arrested in May during the trial in Vilnius of the Rev. Alfonsas Svarinskas, another member of the committee, who was convicted on charges of anti-Soviet agitation and sentenced to seven years of internal exile and three years in a labor camp.

Dissident sources reported that a Latvian dissident, Ints Calitis, was recently tried and sentenced to six years in a labor camp on similar charges.

The crackdown on dissidents and Jewish activists seems to fit into tightening up all around that has been under way throughout the past year. The Soviet press is full of reports about trials of various persons on charges of "economic crimes."

The crackdown has been accompanied by a flurry of statements calling for greater ideological conformity and vigilance. A recurrent rationale for this has been the need to counter President Reagan's "crusade" against communism.

HAZLETON LIONS CLUB CELEBRATES 60TH ANNIVERSARY AND HONORS PAST PRESIDENT CHARLES DEMKO

HON. FRANK HARRISON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1983

● Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday evening, October 22, the Hazleton Lions Club will celebrate its 60th anniversary and, at the same time, will honor its immediate past president, Charles Joseph Demko.

Attorney Charles Joseph Demko is a graduate of the Hazleton High School and the Pennsylvania State University. He received his juris doctor degree from the University of Miami at Coral Gables in June 1977.

Since his return to live and practice law in the Greater Hazleton area, Charlie has served the Hazleton Lions Club with distinction. He has held every office in that club and has been a member of its board of directors from 1978 to the present. Largely due to his efforts, the Hazleton Lions Club was designated as the No. 1 gold division club in district 14-H for 1982-83. Charlie presently serves as the parliamentarian for that district.

He has also been an active member of the Greater Hazleton area unit of the Arthritis Foundation and the Greater Hazleton Area Center for Slavic Studies. He is a parishioner of Holy Trinity (Slovak) Catholic Church and was president of its Holy Name Society from 1979 to 1981.

Over the years, Mr. Speaker, the Hazleton Lions Club has achieved an impressive record of community service and it is with pleasure that I join the entire Greater Hazleton community in paying tribute to that distinguished body on its 60th anniversary. And it is a particular pleasure to pay tribute, at the same time, to my friend and colleague at the bar, Charles Joseph Demko, and, as well, to his wife, Lillian, whose efforts have made his accomplishments possible.

SMEAR

HON. JOHN BRYANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1983

● Mr. BRYANT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday as I walked to the Capitol to cast a vote, I saw a small group of demonstrators on the steps with a large banner attempting to besmudge the name of Martin Luther King, Jr., in the same fashion that the opponents of his causes—human dignity, justice, and freedom—did 20 years ago and more.

Just as Martin Luther King would have, I defend the right of everyone in this country to speak freely—even to make untruthful, hateful, and bigoted statements.

But the most tragic point of the demonstration I witnessed and the recent personal attacks by the gentleman in the other body from North Carolina on the character and patriotism of a man who was assassinated 15 years ago is that both say one thing and mean another.

Although it is the man they talk about, it is not the man they attack. It is his accomplishments and his dream that is their real target. Those who viciously label Martin Luther King, Jr., want to turn back the clock, reverse the all too slow progress this Nation has made toward civil rights, equality, and justice for all.

I believe the majority of Americans would have more respect for a racist who is honest about his or her views than a malicious slanderer who seeks to hide behind the catchwords of fear and hatred.

Few have expressed these sentiments as well as columnist Haynes Johnson, in a recent Washington Post column entitled "Smear," which I commend to the attention of my colleagues and the people of America.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 16, 1983]

SMEAR

A GENERATION-OLD CRUSADE TO DESTROY KING'S NAME AT ANY COST

(By Haynes Johnson)

In late 1965 or early 1966 I received a call from a top aide of FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover. This person had been helpful earlier in stories about the civil rights struggles in the South and especially about FBI knowledge of leaders of the Ku Klux Klan there. He asked if I could drop by his office in the Justice Department, near Hoover's suite, where the FBI was housed then.

When I arrived, shortly before noon, I was shown a pile of documents lying on a table before a couch. I was welcome to take my time and read through them, making notes, but under a stipulation that the meeting then occurring "never took place." The aide then left me alone with the documents.

They were about the Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr. After I finished going through them, another FBI aide escorted me to the elevator. He told me that anything I could write to expose King for what he was would

be a great service to the American people. In other words, discredit him.

The material I had seen consisted of raw, and no doubt selective, FBI files. They were filled with accounts of surveillance and supposition, from anonymous sources, with allusions to communist contacts, communist associations, communist penetration. There were also, as I remember, materials allegedly linking King and the American antiwar movement to communist control and associations with communist front groups around the world.

This was at a time when King, who won the Nobel Peace Prize a year before, had begun to take a strong public position against our expanding combat role in Vietnam. His criticism of U.S. troops being in Vietnam came amid intensifying dissent about the war. Influential politicians and public figures were beginning to question—and directly challenge—President Lyndon B. Johnson's policies with a force that eventually led to his departure from the White House.

Aside from hearsay, gossip and anonymous allegations, I saw nothing in the FBI materials about King that would warrant publishing a story. The real story was the campaign to destroy King's public credibility through selective leaks to the press. For, as it quickly became known, that and similar material were being peddled vigorously by the FBI to other Washington reporters. It was slimy business at best, and in retrospect grows even more so.

I exhume these old bones now because of the latest attempt to defame and discredit King.

It is an even more obscene effort now because it necessitates poking through the garbage of raw files about a man murdered 15 years ago and once more raising an old, unsubstantiated story.

The rationale for this posthumous investigation of King is that it is necessary because of the forthcoming congressional vote on whether to proclaim a national holiday in his honor. That is sophistry of the worst sort. The FBI material now being produced, and being sought, is part of the same old stuff that has been smoldering for nearly a generation. It has been aired over and over again, not the least in congressional testimony and investigations in years past.

There is something sick about this newest smear campaign launched by Sen. Jesse Helms (R-N.C.) and members of the Conservative Caucus. It betrays a desperate need to destroy a reputation at whatever cost, and says more about the motivations of those who indulge in it than it does about the character of the person they still despise even in death.

Some of the material now coming to light reveals that state of mind all too clearly. Here, for example, is a "secret" FBI memo written on June 29, 1965, about a conversation during a golf game between a source whose name is blacked out and two unnamed persons. Under the heading "Martin Luther King, Jr., Security Matter—Communist," it begins:

"We have just obtained information by chance which, if proven true, will give us a golden opportunity to discredit King."

Another, written at the end of 1964, details the FBI and Hoover's concern about King's "criticism of the FBI over the past several years." Six typewritten pages are devoted to "Martin Luther King's Criticism of the Director and FBI" and "Organization of the Current Attack Against the FBI by Martin Luther King."

Still another, early in 1965, just as the great civil rights struggle that resulted in passage of the historic Voting Rights Act was beginning in Selma, Ala., came from an anonymous person in Selma. The informant said he possessed a telegram addressed to Selma's police chief that read, with unintentional humor:

"I have proof Luther [sic] King met with communists in hotel room at Oslo, Norway. Also King paid \$500 to hotel clerk at Finland City for publication [sic] to have breakfast served in bed by white waitress in bikini suit. Norwegian seaman gave me signed documents."

It makes you wonder which the FBI informant thought to be more subversive, the communists or the white woman in the bikini.

The saddest part of this sorry story involves something other than the character, beliefs or associations of Martin Luther King, Jr. It has to do with an attempt to rewrite history.

Behind the need to destroy a reputation lies an even greater need—to prove that what happened in the civil rights struggles of the South and the dissent against the war in Vietnam occurred only because of alien subversive influences. They weren't really American impulses springing out of our best traditions of fairness, justice, compassion and equality of all before the law. They were impulses manipulated by sinister outside forces.

Implicit in that attitude is a contempt for the true character and quality of the American people, not just for that of a black minister who gave voice to some of the oldest American ideals. In the end, this episode does not damage King's reputation or the cause he represented. It serves only to bring discredit on those who engage in it. ●

GOVERNMENT SUPPORT FOR
FREE ENTERPRISE

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1983

● Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a very insightful letter from a Mr. Michael F. Brennan, who states that he is "not employed by Northrop nor does he own any Northrop stock." While I obviously cannot verify that statement, I do know that what he writes is extremely well put.

I believe when a company like Northrop spends its own money to develop a first-class defensive fighter, ideally suited for use in many friendly third world nations, the export and sale of these fighters should be enthusiastically supported by our Government. And, unfortunately, I am not sure that is the case.

I want to share Mr. Brennan's letter with you and our colleagues. While I do not agree with everything he writes, I certainly am in agreement with the overall thrust of his letter. I think the points which he raises are excellent, and I commend them to you and our colleagues.

Mr. MICHAEL F. BRENNAN,
Huntington Beach, Calif.,
September 7, 1983.

Congressman GLEN ANDERSON,
Long Beach, Calif.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ANDERSON: This letter pertains to a subject about which I am very concerned and wish to discuss with you. The subject is the sale of military aircraft to friendly foreign countries. The aircraft of which I speak is the Northrop F-20 Tigershark.

Although I closely follow the aerospace industry, particularly that portion which is located in Southern California, I think it pertinent to mention here that I am not employed by Northrop nor do I own any Northrop stock.

It seems to me there are four major issues which surround this problem. They are: Free enterprise system, national security, jobs, politics.

I would like to comment on each.

Free Enterprise System.—In this day and age of the huge Federal deficits, skyrocketing military hardware prices, which seem to always be written on rubber contracts, major new weapons systems which are years late and do not meet required performance, Northrop stands out as the one major defense contractor who is not afraid to put its money where its mouth is. In direct response to the Carter administration's call for a privately funded and developed intermediate fighter aircraft Northrop responded by investing huge sums of its own money into the Tigershark program. Please note, that as is a Northrop trademark, the Tigershark was delivered and flown head of schedule and to date has met or exceeded all of its performance objectives.

With free enterprise, however, there are no guarantees. In a matter as complex as the sale of military aircraft to foreign countries, however, the success or failure of the program is not so dependent upon whether or not the product you have is marketable but much more so due to whether or not the U.S. Government supports the program.

If we want the free enterprise system to remain alive and well in the defense industry, it is my hope the U.S. Government starts supporting this program a bit more vigorously.

Mr. Anderson, to put it a bit more bluntly, if I were a defense contractor I would be watching this program very, very closely. If the government does not vigorously support it, I would from that day forward not put one cent of my money into any defense related project—I'd let the U.S. Government foot the bill!

National Security.—The F-20 Tigershark was designed as an intermediate export fighter for sale to third world allies who require self-defense capabilities. It is not an F-14 or an F-15 or even an F-16 or F-18. It does, however, possess the capabilities to effectively combat the expected threat facing the vast majority of third world countries.

The F-20 has limited range because it is a defensive fighter. Most third world countries are relatively small in size and don't require aircraft with great ranges. Aircraft with extended range capability have offensive fire power (witness Israel's bombing of the Iraqi nuclear power plant with F-16's in June 1981). I don't feel third world countries should have such capability.

It seems that each time I read my newspaper, I read an article about the United States offering F-16's for sale to Pakistan, Venezuela, Egypt, or South Korea. Turkey wants F-16's or F-18's; other countries seem

to be doing the same—it appears that all these countries are saying—"I want the front line U.S. Fighter, I want the Cadillac". It doesn't make much sense to me, economically or militarily, to sell front line U.S. Fighters to these countries. That is the role the Tigershark was designed to fill; an inexpensive, very capable, intermediate defensive fighter.

Jobs.—The success or lack thereof of the Tigershark program will have a direct impact of the economy of the Los Angeles area. With high unemployment among the blue collar work force (especially so among blacks and other minorities), a production contract for the Tigershark will undoubtedly create thousands of new jobs. The best part about these new jobs is that they will not be make work, dead end, government paid for jobs but rather real jobs in the private sector.

Politics.—I hear often of the Texas lobby. Texas Congressmen and Senators have the reputation of supporting the defense contracts in their state. My question is: What about the California Lobby? Do you support California businesses which are good for both our State and our Nation? The success or failure of this program is directly related to political support. When it was reported that the U.S. was going to allow Jordan to buy Tigersharks, there immediately followed a large outcry for the Jewish Defense League against such a sale. The prospects for the sale almost overnight vanished.

I think it is apparent that Jordan will eventually buy new fighters. Doesn't it make sense for the U.S. to sell them fighters that we can control? If we don't, we'll end up forcing them to turn toward France or possibly the Soviet Union for their military defense needs. That is a situation I don't think we want.

The U.S. Government has to support our allies, all of our allies. We must decide which fighter should be our export fighter and support the sale of that fighter. The problem seems to be purely political. I urge you to resolve it.

I thank you for your time and cooperation. It is my hope that you will strive to reward Northrop's efforts and help strengthen our country's ties with our third world allies by allowing them to strengthen themselves militarily with new self-defense F-20 Tigersharks.

I would appreciate a response to this letter.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL F. BRENNAN.●

ALABAMA DAIRYMAN RECEIVES HONORARY DEGREE

HON. RICHARD C. SHELBY

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1983

● Mr. SHELBY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute and recognize an outstanding citizen and businessman who lives in Greensboro, Ala., located in the Seventh Congressional District.

Following is an article about Mr. John Lemley Morrison, chairman of the board of Dairy Fresh Corp., that recently appeared in the Greensboro Watchman:

ALABAMA DAIRYMAN RECEIVES HONORARY DOCTOR OF SCIENCE

A man who began his career with a \$25 mule and a 100-acre farm bought on credit received an honorary doctorate from Auburn at summer commencement. John Lemley Morrison, chairman of the board of Dairy Fresh Corp., built from that farm a dairy business that has sales of more than \$70 million in Alabama, Florida, Mississippi, and Louisiana.

In awarding him the degree, however, Auburn is not recognizing Mr. Morrison's business acumen alone, but also his concern for his fellowmen and his many contributions to a wide range of interests in Alabama, particularly the Alabama 4-H Foundation.

"It was largely through Mr. Morrison's efforts as chairman of the 4-H Foundation since 1964 that more than a million dollars was raised to construct the Alabama 4-H Youth Development Center," explained Interim President Wilford Bailey in announcing Mr. Morrison's honor. "Since that time, he has provided, through his own gifts and work with others, additional funds for the Center which serves Alabama's 117,000 4-H youth with leadership development training."

At the age of 21 Mr. Morrison took the mule and farm in Hale County and became a farmer and dairyman, eventually buying controlling interest in a Greensboro creamery. He later purchased other dairy businesses including two Mobile area processing firms. He, consequently, is regarded as the father of the dairy business in west Alabama and has also had a major influence on soybean and catfish production in that part of the state. His other business interests include Hale Motors and M & V Development Company.

Over the past 60 years, Mr. Morrison has been a leader in numerous agricultural organizations including the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation state committee, and the Alabama Board of Agriculture. He was named Alabama's Small Businessman of the Year in 1971 and received the Alabama Farm Bureau's Private Enterprise Award in 1981. He is the only Alabamian ever to receive the national award from Epsilon Sigma Phi, the Extension service honorary fraternity.

Outside agriculture, Mr. Morrison has been involved in the support of the Allied Arts Council and the Pixie Theatre in Mobile, Alabama Educational Television, Goodfellows of Mobile College, and the Mobile Advisory Council of Boy Scouts of America. He is a member of the Huntington College Advisory Committee and a trustee of Blue Cross/Blue Shield of Alabama.

Mr. Morrison's contacts with 4-H and with Auburn came through his daughter, Lemuel, now a pediatrician at the University of South Alabama, when she was state 4-H dairy foods project winner. When the Alabama 4-H Foundation was organized in 1954, he was a charter member of the board. Since the Center was established two years ago, he has devoted an average of one day per week to continued work for it, helping to raise more than \$500,000 in additional funds.

Mr. Morrison has helped guide the formation of the Alabama Catfish Farming Center in Greensboro which is operated cooperatively by Auburn University and the Soil Conservation Service. He has also been instrumental in the development of a state docks facility at Demopolis.

Mr. Speaker, John Lemley Morrison is a fine example of an individual who makes his community a strong, healthy, and safe environment in which to work and live. He is an asset to his community as a leader of outstanding dedication whose praiseworthy contributions serve as an inspiration to all of us.

We need more individuals like John Lemley Morrison in this country who are not afraid to get out and work for ideals they believe in. He has given so much of himself to others and I believe this tribute is certainly deserving to this outstanding individual.

The dairy industry is fortunate to have John on their team, and I wish him the very best in all future endeavors. ●

A NEW U.S. APPROACH TO SOUTH AFRICA

HON. JULIAN C. DIXON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1983

● Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, There has been a great deal of frustration in the United States and among our friends in Africa over the stance which the Reagan administration has taken toward South Africa.

President Reagan has initiated unprecedented levels of diplomatic and technological cooperation with South Africa, and in exchange we have witnessed virtually no progress in achieving independence for Namibia or justice for millions of South African blacks living under the cruel apartheid system.

Our distinguished colleague, the Honorable HOWARD WOLFE, serves with distinction as chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Africa. He has given strong personal leadership to efforts seeking a change in U.S. posture toward South Africa, and he recently wrote an editorial commenting on the problems with President Reagan's "constructive engagement" approach.

I recommend this article to my colleagues, and hope that its important points will be given serious consideration.

The article follows:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Oct. 13, 1983]

A NEW U.S. APPROACH TO SOUTH AFRICA—LET'S DISSOCIATE OURSELVES FROM APARTHEID, REGIONAL AGGRESSION

(By Howard Wolfe)

There are now five major bills pending before the U.S. Congress concerning South Africa, and many more resolutions. Once again, following a lull during the first two years of the Reagan Administration, South Africa is the focus of congressional scrutiny. Why should this be so?

South Africa has been much on our minds ever since the National Party took power in 1948. It has spent those years entrenching

and perfecting its system of institutionalized racism in open defiance of attempts by most other U.N. member states to have it end apartheid and extend political and social equality to all its citizens. Yet South Africa continues its horrendous policies that deny even a modicum of basic human rights to the vast majority of its people.

This Administration has insisted that South Africa is trying to reform. The State Department's Bureau of African Affairs in early 1981 initiated a series of steps, termed "constructive management," based on the premise that quiet diplomacy and closer U.S. association with the South Africa regime would encourage internal change and lead South Africa to end its illegal occupation of Namibia.

Thus the Administration has expanded our diplomatic presence in South Africa. It has allowed visits by "homelands" leaders in contravention of our own consular laws, and has increased the numbers of military attaches in our respective embassies. It has "mistakenly" given visas to South African military and intelligence personnel. It has sent nuclear technicians to South Africa, and has amended U.S. policies to allow the sale and export of military and police equipment to South Africa. And it has vetoed a U.N. resolution condemning South African aggression against Angola—all in the name of "constructive engagement."

And what has been South Africa's response to all these "constructive engagement" carrots?

First, the government's internal repression has intensified sharply in the last 2½ years. Pass-law detentions have increased; new restrictions have been imposed on the press; millions of black South Africans have been forcibly returned to "homelands"; citizens who dare to dissent, black and white, continue to be subject to arbitrary banning, and the continued use of torture methods during detention have led to new unexplained deaths in prison.

Second, South Africa continues to block a settlement of the Namibia conflict, successfully using the American insistence on linking Namibia's independence to the removal of Cuban troops from Angola as a way of prolonging a political settlement in that embattled territory.

Third, South Africa has dangerously escalated its destabilizing military and economic aggression against its black-ruled neighbors. South Africa occupies Angolan soil, and gives support to dissident groups in Angola and Mozambique. It has launched murderous raids into Lesotho and Mozambique. It has sought to overthrow the Seychelles government. And it has not hesitated to use economic sabotage against Zimbabwe and Mozambique as an added stick.

In short, "constructive engagement" has been an utter failure. It is clear that the options embraced by the Reagan Administration in hopes of alleviating a worsening situation in South Africa have in fact merely made matters worse. Not only is there more upheaval and violence in the southern African region today, but now—for the first time and as a direct consequence of "constructive engagement"—the United States has become directly implicated in these developments. We must understand the enormous damage that "constructive engagement" has done to American interests. For in African eyes the United States is now viewed as colluding with the South African government in delaying Namibia's independence, in fostering regional instability and in preserving the abhorrent system of apartheid.

It is against this backdrop that I and a number of my colleagues are pressing for the passage of legislation to recast the United States' foreign policy toward South Africa. We need to act now, before it is too late—too late to avoid an Armageddon in South Africa, and too late to dissociate the United States from apartheid and from South Africa's regional aggression.

Among the measures pending that call for various types of sanctions against the South African government, three are scheduled for a House vote on Tuesday: A bill by Rep. Howard L. Berman (D-Calif.) would reinstitute restrictions on exports to South Africa's police and military. Rep. Stephen J. Solarz's (D-N.Y.) bill would impose new restrictions on commercial activity and mandate fair employment practices for all U.S. companies doing business in South Africa, and a bill by William H. Gray III (D-Pa.) would prohibit new U.S. corporate investment in South Africa until the President determines that there is demonstrable progress toward the elimination of apartheid.

Already passed and awaiting final approval is a bill by Rep. Julian C. Dixon (D-Calif.) that would disallow U.S. votes in the International Monetary Fund on behalf of nations that practice apartheid. Also pending is a bill by Rep. Charles B. Rangel (D-N.Y.) that would prohibit nuclear relations with South Africa.

These are the signals that we should be sending to South Africa's government so that it has no doubt concerning where the United States stands on apartheid, on the question of Namibia's independence and on South Africa's regional aggression. That country should know that its continued intransigence on these matters will precipitate changes in its relationship with the United States, and that those changes will prove costly.

U.S. interests on that continent require a redirection of American foreign policy toward South Africa. We cannot continue to struggle to achieve a just society at home and equivocate on our international obligations abroad. The racism and the denial of political rights that we will not tolerate at home must not be condoned by our posture overseas. Our national values, and our national interests, dictate that we act on South Africa before it is too late. ●

THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY AND AMORTIZATION OF ST. MARY'S CHURCH MORTGAGE, WILKES-BARRE, PA.

HON. FRANK HARRISON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1983

● Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday evening, October 15, the parishioners of St. Mary's Antiochian Orthodox Church celebrated the 75th anniversary of their parish and the amortization of their church's mortgage.

The founding fathers of St. Mary's began their immigration to America in the year 1890. The families of Saba, Hyder, Broody, Audi, Simon, Serhan, and Atiyeh hailed from the area of the mountains of Lebanon, above Tripoli.

The Syrian Orthodox families of Betar, Abraham, Johns, Cross, Namey, Baroody, and Solomon were among the earliest to arrive from the area of Latakia before 1900.

The young men came alone and found work here under sponsorship of Protestant missionaries in the Middle East. Once these single men earned enough to set up homes, they returned to their homeland to marry and raise children in America. They sought religious freedom and free enterprise in the land of hope and promise. Several of the young men married American women of Irish and Dutch descent and made happy marriages.

By the year 1904, 35 families resided in the Rolling Mill Hill section of Wilkes-Barre, and they convened to organize a parish. A worthy householder, Michael Saba, was elected to be the new clergyman. A bishop from Christian Russia, Raphael of Blessed Memory, came from New York City and ordained the priest. Father Michael served the parish for 4 years. By the year 1908, 30 new families joined the parish, and a new priest, Father George Kattouf, led ably in the purchase of land at 132 High Street in Wilkes-Barre, and the church building was completed at a cost of \$9,000.

A rectory was also built in 1912, behind the church, at 19 McCarragher Street for \$4,000.

The congregation grew steadily until 1914, when the First World War began. A number of young men joined the Army and served well. By the year 1928, the old church was enlarged and lifted to build a large community hall underneath, at a cost of \$13,000. The congregation, by 1940, was 300 families strong, and boasted business and professional people. During World War II, 130 of its young men served in the Armed Forces and 7 lost their lives in the European theater.

In 1958, the congregation voted to erect a new church edifice, hall, and rectory. This was done in the year 1969, located at 905 South Main Street, Wilkes-Barre, Pa., at a cost of \$800,000. The parish has been active in all civic activities.

Over the years, 534 marriages and 2,156 baptisms have been performed in the buildings of St. Mary's.

And so, Mr. Speaker, October 15 was, indeed, a very special day for the Wilkes-Barre community. At a banquet that evening all of us rejoiced with Very Rev. Herbert G. Nahas, the pastor, and all of the people of St. Mary's Antiochian Orthodox Church. It was my honor to be there, Mr. Speaker, and it is my pleasure today to share this significant moment in the history of the Wyoming Valley with my friends and colleagues in the House. ◊

THE COSTLY AND CRAZY ARMS RACE IN SPACE

HON. MEL LEVINE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1983

◊ Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be increasing concern over the long-term consequences of the development of advanced antisatellite (ASAT) weapons. While there are some who advocate their development, there are many reasons why it would be a bad idea. Those reasons are explained in an article titled "We're About To Launch a Costly and Crazy Arms Race in Space," which appeared in the October 16 Washington Post.

The author says in part:

This competition [between the United States and the Soviet Union to develop ASAT's] will be almost unimaginably expensive; it will be almost impossible to turn back once it has commenced, and even if the weapons involved work the way they are supposed to, the nation will be less secure in the end.

I urge my colleagues to read this article, which appears below. It explains clearly the madness of the endeavor we would be embarking upon.

There are many reasonable and constructive alternatives to pursuing ever-elusive military superiority on yet another battlefield, space. I have introduced a resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 140, expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should initiate talks with Soviet leaders, and with other governments interested in space activities, to explore the opportunities for cooperative East-West ventures in space, as an alternative to an arms race in space.

Congressman McHUGH, a member of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee will offer an amendment to the defense appropriations bill to delete \$19.4 million for procurement of ASAT's during full committee consideration this week. This is an important amendment whose passage would be a significant step in the right direction.

Entering a space arms race with the Soviet Union is in the interest of no one. The prospect of an arms race in space between the United States and the Soviet Union has aroused worldwide concern expressed publicly by the governments of many countries, including most of our allies. An arms race in space would open the door to a range of new weapons systems that would seriously threaten global stability, undermine the prospects for successful arms control agreements, and create pressures for new defense expenditures unprecedented in scope and which we can ill afford.

There is nothing to be gained by pursuing a space arms race between

the two superpowers. The time to stop it is now.

WE'RE ABOUT TO LAUNCH A COSTLY AND CRAZY ARMS RACE IN SPACE

(By Fred Kaplan)

Sometime very soon, (the date is classified), the United States will test a weapon system that promises to burst through a new threshold in the arms race—a race for military supremacy in outer space. This competition will be almost unimaginably expensive; it will be almost impossible to turn back once it has commenced, and even if the weapons involved work the way they are supposed to, the nation will be less secure in the end.

The new weapon seems deceptively harmless at first glance; a 12-by-13 inch cylinder, loaded with telescopes and infrared sensors, attached to a two-stage rocket small enough to fit under an F-15 jet fighter. The drama—and potential danger—lies in what this small package is designed to do. It's called a Miniature Homing Vehicle (MHV), and the idea is to fly the F-15 almost vertically up to the edge of the atmosphere, then fire the MHV into outer space, where it will home in on—and kill—an enemy satellite.

If the first few tests of the MHV system succeed, we may find ourselves propelled, almost inexorably, toward a new era of military conflict. Maj. Gen. John H. Storrie, director of space for Air Force plans and operations, told a House committee last March: "Space is a place; it is not a mission. We are going to continue to do the things in space that we do in the atmosphere and on the ground and on the seas"—that is, to prepare to fight and win wars. A study signed last year by the Air Force chief of staff, titled "Air Force 2000," calls for "space superiority," which requires "the capability to destroy hostile space systems."

Already, both sides—especially the United States—depend on space for a wide variety of military missions. Most of what we know about the Soviet military, especially about its nuclear weapons, comes from satellites. A great deal of military communications, command-control networks, navigational aids and other support systems also are channeled through satellites. Moreover, Maj. Gen. Bernard Randolph, director of the Air Force space systems, has testified that a "major" objective of U.S. space plans is "to expand" our military capabilities in space.

The more we rely on military platforms in space, the more incentive the Soviets will have to develop their own advanced antisatellite (ASAT) weapons, and thus an increasingly crucial element of our military command network will become increasingly vulnerable.

"Right now," according to Paul Stares of the Brookings Institution, "if we lose our space systems, we'd be hurt but not crippled. If we continue to increase our dependence on space systems, then we're just digging a hole for ourselves."

There's one way out of this hole—and that is to negotiate an ASAT arms-control agreement with the Russians. Yet after our forthcoming ASAT tests, this may be impossible. Air Force officials have testified that it will take only six hours to install an MHV ASAT system on an F-15 fighter anywhere in the world, at a cost of only \$632,000 per plane. Says Stares, "There's no way the Russians could have confidence that every F-15 isn't carrying an ASAT. What are we going to do? Paint the F-15 different colors if it has an ASAT mission?"

Ironically, this moment when we are about to test a new ASAT system is both the last and probably one of the best opportunities for getting ASAT arms-control negotiations under way. To see why requires a brief digression into history.

The United States was the first to develop an ASAT system. From 1963-67, the U.S. Army tested some of its Nike-Zeus ABMs as satellite killers. From 1964-68, the U.S. Air Force fired Thor missiles at deactivated satellites in outer space in what was called the "Squanto Terror" tests (or, in a lower key, "Program 437"). This program was kept alive until 1975.

Not until 1968—well after the Air Force had declared Program 437 "operational"—did the Soviets start up their own ASAT program. The Soviet system is substantially more unwieldy than either the U.S. programs of the 1960s or our forthcoming MHV plan. Their scheme was to launch a "killer satellite" in an orbit that crosses an enemy satellite, and then to blow up the killer, destroying the enemy spacecraft with shrapnel.

Over the next 14 years, the Soviets conducted 20 tests. They have used two different types of guidance systems. One directs the killer-satellite by shining a radar beam on the target. The other is more passive, with infrared systems which seek out the target by the heat that it generates in outer space.

According to John Pike of the Federation of American Scientists, the Russians tested the radar-seeker version 14 times, most recently in 1981, of which 10 were successes. However, more recently, they tested the passive infrared-seeker version six times—and all six were duds.

Even the 10 successes had their limitations. They were all conducted at low altitudes, whereas most U.S. satellites—including all early-warning satellites—are stationed at very high altitudes. They were also conducted within very narrow angles or inclinations (from 60 to 66 degrees), making it difficult to approach even the low-altitude American satellites. Stephen Meyer of MIT concludes, "They've really never had a test of what it would be like going against a real U.S. target."

From 1977-81, the Soviets stopped testing ASATs. Over part of that period, the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. held three series of talks on negotiating an ASAT arms-control agreement. Then came the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, the death of SALT II—and the ASAT talks faded away.

Last August, Soviet leader Yuri Andropov announced a moratorium on all ASAT testing, and Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko submitted an ASAT arms-control proposal to the United Nations, with terms that seem to indicate seriousness. One obvious reason for this seriousness is a realization that the United States is about to come out with a new ASAT system that will probably be much more successful than the Soviet model.

Indeed, administration officials have treated the idea of negotiations dismissively precisely because Andropov has proposed them. The reasoning: his fear of our ASAT only confirms that it can give us an edge in the arms race.

But this is shortsighted, and not just because it lessens the likelihood of an arms-control treaty. If the United States goes ahead and tests its new ASAT system, the Soviets undoubtedly will break the moratorium and resume their own testing—and probably develop a better weapon than the

one they have now. This will provoke us to upgrade our system. . . . And the race is on.

From here, any number of scenarios can be imagined: the U.S. or the U.S.S.R. (or both) develops an ASAT that can (potentially) strike satellites at high altitudes as well as low altitudes, thus endangering the all-important early-warning satellites. The other side then develops a system—perhaps involving lasers—that can attack this new ASAT system. Or perhaps he develops a space-based battle station that can defend the satellites. Then the other side builds systems that can attack the defenders. And so it goes. . . .

Indeed, this scenario is precisely what some people have in mind. Although the U.S. Miniature Homing Vehicle program dates back to 1978, its most ardent supporters view it as an entering wedge into the whole panoply of space weapons—some on the drawing boards, some as yet only sparks and glimmers in the fertile imaginations of technocratic enthusiasts—that fall under the rubric of "Star Wars."

Star Wars advocates tasted their first dose of legitimacy last March, when President Reagan told a nationwide TV audience of his "vision of the future." He held out the "hope" that a network of antiballistic missiles (ABMs), space lasers and battle stations—based on decades of research—will "intercept and destroy strategic ballistic missiles before they reach our own soil or that of our allies."

For years, a fringe element—led by Sen. Malcolm Wallop (R-Wyo.) in Congress, Edward Teller and Gen. Daniel Graham (Ret.) in the military-scientific community, and several others in various bureaucracies and think tanks on the east and west coasts—have been keen on moving the arms competition into space. A very small group within the Air Force, recently organized into a Space Command, believes that space can be—as Thomas Karas calls it in his book that chronicles this community—"The New High Ground" from which the United States can reign supreme in all other arenas of warfare.

Reagan's speech—which was heavily influenced by talks with Teller—gave this group the legitimacy that it has long sought. Almost at once, "Beltway bandits" and other consulting firms put in contract bids to study "the military utility of space." More important, it became a high-priority issue inside the national-security bureaucracy.

Over the summer, three major outside studies were commissioned on the politics and technology of Star Wars. At this moment, an interagency group consisting of officials from the State Department, the Pentagon, the National Security Council and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is drawing up evaluations of those studies to present to the president sometime within the next month.

Officials involved in the studies and the interagency meetings say that nobody now knows how to go about even beginning to build a Star Wars system. Says one Pentagon official, "At this point we have no consensus on what it all means. . . . I don't think we have the kind of answers that we could base any sort of policy on."

In any case, officials are discovering technical problems that may be insurmountable. A ground-based laser wouldn't work through clouds. Even Maj. Gen. Bernard Randolph, director of Air Force space systems, told a House committee last spring that a space-based laser would require 10

megawatts of power (some say much more) and would weigh 150,000 pounds—well beyond the transport capacity of the Space Shuttle. To provide even "a thin ABM capability," we would need 50-100 of these systems. Further-more, the systems must have perfect accuracy; he likened the mission to pointing a beam "from the Washington Monument to a baseball on the top of the Empire State Building and hold[ing] it there while both of you are moving."

Then there's the cost. Air Force studies have put it at \$500 billion. An analyst on one of the government-sponsored study-groups puts it as high as \$1.2 trillion.

And that probably would not be the end of it. Officials and analysts point out that the Russians could "spoof" any space-based ABM system much more cheaply than it would take us to build one. Just a few techniques: cover the surface of a missile with a mirror that reflects the laser beam; jam the communications between the space system and the ground-control station; shot it down with a laser system yourself. As one skeptical official puts it, "If it can shoot down a ballistic missile, why can't it shoot down its twin brother?"

Still, the interagency group will not advise Reagan to abandon the Star Wars idea as a piece of budget-busting, technically hopeless pie-in-the-sky. "This is the president's program," says one skeptical official. "We can't tell the president that he's got a nutty idea." Instead, it will probably recommend that the military spend the next several years doing research on whether these problems can be overcome. Even this will cost quite a bit of money.

For example, Robert S. Cooper, Director of the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA), testified last spring that the "Space Laser Program Plan," which will merely "bring us to a point where we can make reliable planning estimates of weapon development costs and schedules," will cost \$900 million. Other basic research of this sort could cost as much as \$4 billion a year—maybe more—for several years; and even then, nobody will know very much more than before.

All of which leads some analysts to wonder whether it is sensible to start treading down this seemingly endless road to begin with. Though the ASAT program and the Star Wars scheme have different origins, the road to the latter can begin with the former. In fact, the kind of technology needed for advanced ASAT systems—tracking mechanisms, sensors, beams and so forth—is quite similar to the technology needed for shooting down ballistic missiles. And the logic of the ASAT/counter-ASAT arms race provides a grand opportunity for the Star War brigade to bring in their programs through various side or rear entrances if they end up getting locked out of the front door.

The Reagan administration, however, is drawing no connections between ASAT and Star Wars. There is an interagency group dealing with Star Wars and another dealing with ASAT—but they are composed of different people and they never meet. Similarly, the group concerned with ASAT is contemplating various arms-control ideas—but, according to officials, no one has seriously considered delaying the ASAT test until after these ideas have been fully explored.

In short, an historic opportunity to halt a whole new age in the arms race is being neglected, even ignored—not only by the administration, but by congress as well. (It is worth noting that the nuclear freeze move-

ments also have paid scant attention to the imminent prospect of an arms race in space.)

It wouldn't be the first time. In 1970, to cite just the most recent parallel, the United States deployed the Minuteman III intercontinental ballistic missile. It incorporated new technology called MIRVs (multiple independently targetable reentry vehicles), which allowed one missile to carry several warheads, each of which could be guided to separate targets.

Before MIRVs, a first strike destroying the other side's land-based missiles was impossible; one missile could hit only one enemy missile; if one side built extra missiles, the other side could counter by building more too. However, with MIRVs, a single missile could (theoretically) destroy several enemy missiles. If the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. acquired MIRVs, both sides would be at once capable of destroying the other's land-based missiles and vulnerable to such an attack themselves.

Some U.S. officials favored proposing a ban on MIRVs during the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks, but this was rejected because others felt MIRVs gave us a strategic edge over the Russians. Four years later, the Russians deployed their own MIRVs, and now the same people who opposed a MIRV ban a decade ago decry the Soviet MIRVs which they claim have made our own Minuteman missiles vulnerable.

The most interesting strategic arms-control proposal of recent years calls for getting rid of MIRVs. But it's probably too late.

Henry Kissinger told reporters in 1974, "I would say in retrospect that I wish I had thought through the implications of a MIRVed world more thoughtfully in 1969 and 1970 than I did." But Kissinger's former NSC aides say that MIRVs were studied thoroughly, that Kissinger knew exactly what their implications were from the beginning, but went ahead with them anyway—to gain a strategic edge.

It's the same with the upcoming ASAT test and the growing political pressure for at least elements of the Star Wars plan. As in the case of MIRVs, the administration is failing—even refusing—to think through the implications before the world changes in ways it may later regret. ●

TRIBUTE TO DR. ENZO PAOLETTI AND DENNIS PANICALI—FOR A SCIENTIFIC BREAKTHROUGH OF ENORMOUS IMPORTANCE

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1983

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to pay tribute to two remarkable research scientists credited with the development of a new miracle vaccine which one day may help to prevent such diseases as malaria, herpes, and certain strains of the flu. Dr. Enzo Paoletti and Dr. Dennis L. Panicali, research scientists employed by the New York State Health Department, were the developers of the new vaccine which may constitute a scientific breakthrough of enormous future importance.

As New York Gov. Mario Cuomo put it yesterday "We are proud of you." I join with the Governor in conveying that sentiment and have a dual reason for it—the first is that both of these doctors are Italian Americans and add to a long line of distinguished men and women of science and medicine from this community. The second is the work was done under the auspices of the New York State Health Department.

There has been much media attention focused on this vaccine since it was announced yesterday, and I would like to share with my colleagues one article from the New York Post which discusses the vaccine and how it would work and a second article from the New York Times discussing the two men responsible for its development.

The United States has long been the leader in the field of scientific research—yet concerns have been raised in recent years about maintaining our preeminence. Good research products and discoveries come from men and women who have had a good educational foundation in their respective fields. Therefore it is imperative that we continue to stress the basics of math and science in all of the classrooms in our Nation. We must work on the future—we should not be content until we have ways of combating all of the major diseases which take our citizens in such tragic numbers each year.

We should not be afraid to be bold and take risks in our research and our decisions to provide funds for research projects. It is more than significant that this dramatic research breakthrough came from work done in a public health department of a State which are normally where breakthroughs of this type are accomplished. In fact as the New York Times said today, "The success of the two researchers also represents an unusual achievement within a State health department that is known more for its public health functions than for esoteric experiments involving genetics and highly complex molecular biology."

Again my congratulations to Drs. Panicali and Paoletti for the remarkable work they have done and the great good it holds in store for so many people.

[From the New York Post, Oct. 19, 1983]

STATE DOCS DISCOVER NEW MIRACLE VACCINE

(By Fredric Dicker and Linda Stevens)

A NEW super-vaccine has been developed that one day may prevent such scourges as hepatitis, malaria, sexual herpes and the flu, state health officials announced yesterday.

The history-making vaccine some are calling the biggest breakthrough since penicillin has already been tested successfully on animals.

The super-shot also could be used against as many as 14 other diseases at a time, it was revealed.

And according to the discoverers, the vaccine, when perfected, may be administered for as little as 30 cents a shot.

Amazingly, the super vaccine uses the 200-year-old smallpox vaccine as its base, with genes from viruses like the flu being transplanted in the smallpox serum.

The doctors credited with the historic breakthrough are Enzo Paoletti and Dennis Panicali of the N.Y. State Health Dept.'s Center for Laboratories and Research.

"We are still a few years away from use by the general public, but I would hope it is not very long away," said Paoletti.

He said testing of the new vaccine on humans is probably at least three years away.

But if tests continue as overwhelmingly positive as they are now, worldwide use of the new "one-shot" may be commonplace within a decade.

Paoletti, 40, was quick to emphasize that the vaccine will not be a cure for any disease, but rather a preventive measure.

"We will know more with further testing," he said. "Certainly the potential is there, but we can't be sure."

Explaining the vaccine's possible future as a polyvalent (multi-disease) immunizing agent, he said "there is room now for 12 to 15 genes in the vaccinia."

In that event, a person might one day be immunized against 15 diseases by a single shot.

The method uses state-of-the-art recombinant DNA techniques to "transplant" genes from diseased cells into the cowpox from which the smallpox vaccine is made.

"What we do is very simple," said Panicali, a 34-year-old senior research scientist in the CLR virology laboratory.

"We take the vaccinia virus from the smallpox vaccine and by a variety of genetic engineering techniques we take the foreign substance [usually a protein] that we're interested in—herpes, hepatitis, influenza and just put it into that virus."

"When the virus [reproduces] inside the [patient], it produces proteins not only from the smallpox but also that one protein from herpes or hepatitis or influenza virus, and that one produces an immunological response."

"We're just putting a new gene into the vaccinia virus."

Panicali said research into the new vaccine began about three years ago—with no hit-and-miss experimentation.

"We knew exactly what we were setting out to do," he said. "We wanted to see whether we could put something in and get it expressed."

In preliminary animal tests, said State Health Dept. Commissioner David Axelrod, M.D., the genetically altered smallpox vaccine produced antibodies which protected the animals against the targeted diseases.

For instance, he said, three groups of mice were infected with usually-lethal doses of the herpes simplex virus.

As many as 70 percent in two groups died. But the third group was inoculated with the new vaccine, and none of the mice died.

Beyond the fact that it may be applicable to so many diseases, the new technique has more practical advantages.

For instance, it produces vaccines which need no refrigeration and can in fact be freeze-dried, making them ideal for use in remote areas.

"And they do not require highly-skilled personnel to administer them," said Dr. Paoletti. "As you know, smallpox vaccine requires only a scratching of the skin."

"And only one dose would be needed."

[From the New York Times, Oct. 19, 1983]
RESEARCHERS ARE HAILED AS NEW GENETICS
BREED

(By Ronald Sullivan)

Dr. Enzo Paoletti and Dr. Dennis L. Panicali, the New York State Health Department research scientists who announced the development of an experimental vaccine for infectious diseases, were described yesterday as part of a new generation of laboratory scientists who are unlocking the genetic secrets of cell biology.

The success of the two researchers also represents an unusual achievement within a state health department that is known more for its public health functions than for esoteric experiments involving genetics and highly complex molecular biology.

Their success was also described as a public testament to Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of New York for many years, who was the object of widespread criticism in the 1960's for building a \$100 million laboratory research facility under the State Government Mall in Albany where the two scientists work.

According to Dr. Herbert W. Dickerman, deputy director of the health department's Center for Laboratories and Research, the two men are in the "true mode" of rapidly developing research into gene splicing and deoxyribonucleic acid, or DNA, a basic component of chromosomes that contains the genetic code for transmitting the hereditary pattern.

PRAISE FOR 'DNA JOCKS'

"Dr. Paoletti is a very dedicated virologist who works intensely hard and who is very creative," Dr. Dickerman said. He described Dr. Panicali as a "leading genetic scientist."

Fellow researchers described the two scientists as "DNA jocks," using the latest technology and scientific advancements in attempting to make viruses work for man in vaccines instead of against him in the form of disease.

For the most part, scientific research achievements are more associated with national institutes, rich pharmaceutical companies or prominent academic research centers. However, Dr. Dickerman described the state's research laboratories in Albany as a smaller combination of the National Centers for Disease Control and the National Institutes of Health.

"We combine the disease fighting capability of the C.D.C. and the research effort of the N.I.H. at the state level," he said in an interview.

STATE COMMISSIONER CREDITED

Dr. Paoletti and Dr. Panicali interrupted a celebration last night at a restaurant in Manhattan to give credit to Dr. David Axelrod, the State Commissioner of Health, for attracting them to New York in the first place and for providing the research support they needed to carry out their work.

Dr. Axelrod formerly headed the state laboratories before he was named commissioner, and his scientific background was cited as a major reason why the state has become a leader in scientific research.

AWAY FROM THE LABORATORY

"Dr. Axelrod was the one who attracted me to New York," said Dr. Panicali. He said the move to New York from the Medical College of Georgia also allowed him and his wife and two small boys to move back to a part of the country where he had grown up.

"My family is very important to me, probably more than anything I might accomplish with DNA," he said.

Both scientists relish the outdoor life the Albany region offers and they spend many weekends backpacking with the families in the nearby Berkshires and Adirondacks. While Dr. Paoletti, who is 40 years old, loves music, Dr. Panicali, who is 34, is an avid racketball player.

Dr. Paoletti was born in Italy. He was graduated from Canisius College in Buffalo and received his doctorate from the State University of New York at Buffalo. He worked at the National Institutes of Health and the Albany Medical College before joining the state center where he holds the rank of senior research scientist. He is married and has three children.

Dr. Panicali was born in Bridgeport and was graduated from the University of Connecticut. He received his doctorate in cell and molecular biology from the Medical College of Georgia.

Both men are members of the American Society for Microbiology and the American Society for Virology. ●

THE GUTLESS HOUSE?

HON. TRENT LOTT

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1983

● Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, the lead editorial in the Monday, October 10 Washington Post, entitled "The Gutless House," was extremely critical of the House's failure to act on three critical issues: Immigration reform, criminal sentencing reform, and legislation to resolve the constitutional crisis faced by the Nation's Federal bankruptcy courts.

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that the Democratic leadership of this House has ducked the tough issues in the interest of purely partisan political considerations. Twice in the last 2 years the Senate has passed—by large bipartisan margins—legislation reforming our Nation's immigration policies. Twice the Senate has approved legislation overhauling criminal sentencing laws. The Senate has also responded to the challenge of rewriting Federal bankruptcy court legislation to conform the statutes to the U.S. Supreme Court's objections.

The President has also taken the lead on these issues in recommending legislation to the Congress on both immigration policy and criminal code reform.

Rather than bite the bullet and schedule these issues for consideration by this House, all we hear from the Democratic leadership is a lot of gum-flapping about the lack of a constituency for these issues.

What about the hundreds of thousands of unemployed workers in this country who could be employed in jobs now being occupied by illegal aliens? Are the victims of serious crimes committed by individuals who receive dis-

proportionate sentencing for those crimes not a constituency?

Mr. Speaker, I believe that a majority of the Members of this House do want to debate these issues, and that they reflect the concerns of the majority of the American people. We should not let the interests of a few outweigh the concerns of many.

I am including with my remarks a copy of the Washington Post editorial, which I commend to the attention of all of my colleagues.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 10, 1983]

THE GUTLESS HOUSE

Why do the members of the House of Representatives think they were elected. At their most high-minded, a majority would no doubt declare that they were chosen to deal with the difficult problems facing this nation, to consider possible solutions carefully, to amend and compromise and to enact legislation to deal with those problems. It would not go into their formal descriptions of what they do to concede that they like to duck tough ones with the excuse, "This problem is controversial and we're only a year and a couple of months away from an election." This, they would know, is not an attractive position. It's an admission of political cowardice, a refusal to take on a task which is the very essence of the job.

It would be reasonable for the House leaders to refuse to consider measures passed by the Senate because they preferred the status quo. But there are at least three areas where the House refuses to act in spite of the fact that there is general agreement that the status quo is unacceptable. The first of these involves the federal bankruptcy courts, which have been living in a state of limbo for almost a year following a Supreme Court decision casting doubt on the authority of the judges. The courts are operating under interim rules that may or may not be valid. The Senate passed a bill last April, but the House leadership has not sent a bill to the floor.

Criminal sentencing in the federal courts is another controversial matter. Everyone knows that the present system is in need of overhaul if widely disparate sentences in different parts of the country are to be eliminated. The subject has been studied by scholars, committees and task forces for a decade. Yes, there are differences to be resolved, but twice in recent years the Senate has bitten the bullet and passed sentence reform legislation. The House always balks.

This week we have seen this pattern repeat itself in the area of immigration reform. Here we have a national problem that many believe is reaching crisis proportions. In 1979, Congress created a select commission to study the problem. And in 1981, the attorney general asked a task force for suggestions. Both study groups recommended some form of employer sanctions and amnesty. Twice, by large bipartisan margins, the Senate has passed an immigration reform bill with these elements at the heart of its compromise, and twice the House has failed to act.

Why? Because the bill is controversial; because the choices are hard; because not everyone is perfectly satisfied with each and every provision. There is an element of bad faith here, since the Senate faced exactly the same choices, dealt with the same lobbies, took the same political risks only to

have the House—like Lucy holding the football for Charlie Brown—pull back at the crucial moment.

Legislators are not supposed to wait for all opposition to die down and for perfect unanimity to be achieved before acting. It is their responsibility to listen to all viewpoints, to decide the best solution and to lead in the interests of the whole nation. That was finally done in the case of Social Security, even though it required the formation of a nonpartisan, nonelected commission to devise a final compromise. Beneficiaries raised objections because they had to give up some benefits; workers were not happy about tax increases. If Congress had waited for all the interested parties to agree on one solution, the Social Security system would be bankrupt. Competing interests raise objections to immigration reform, too, but it is the responsibility of Congress to make hard choices and to devise a fair and workable solution to a national problem. Last week, the House leaders refused to accept this responsibility and made embarrassing excuses for their default. They have pleased some, but they have failed the American people by choosing the sidelines when they were needed on the field.●

CHESAPEAKE BAY

HON. ROY DYSON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1983

● Mr. DYSON. Mr. Speaker, I was asked to testify yesterday before the House Public Works Subcommittee on Water Resources on a bill I introduced earlier this year that would provide funds for the cleanup of the Chesapeake Bay. This legislation is an important first step in restoring the bay's water quality and in dealing with all the interests in the Chesapeake Bay region.

TESTIMONY OF CONGRESSMAN ROY DYSON

Mr. Chairman (Mr. ROE) and distinguished members of the Subcommittee, I want to thank you for inviting me to testify a second time before you on H.R. 2817, legislation I introduced earlier this year that would amend the Clean Water Act to provide for the enhanced water quality of the Chesapeake Bay.

In my previous testimony of August 2d, I indicated that the Bay is the major economic and environmental resource of my home State of Maryland and is of extreme importance to all states in the Chesapeake Bay region. It provides thousands of people with jobs in the fishing and outdoor recreation industries, particularly constituents of mine in Maryland's First Congressional District. It is a thoroughfare for nearly \$240 million in maritime commerce annually. And it is home to countless forms of marine and aquatic life.

My purpose in speaking to you today is to bring you up to date on significant events in the ongoing effort to improve the quality of the Bay.

First, at the end of September, the Environmental Protection Agency released its official findings from the Chesapeake Bay Study. This 7-year, \$27 million effort answered some of the most pressing questions about conditions in the Bay. These results,

however, only indicate how much work remains to be accomplished.

I take some satisfaction in the completion of this project since I secured the funding to finish this analysis in the final days of the 97th Congress.

The EPA's report clearly indicates that the Bay is an ecosystem in decline. It suggests that actions throughout the Bay's 64,000-mile watershed can affect the water quality of the rivers flowing into the Bay. Degradation of the Bay's water and sediment quality can, in turn, affect the living resources in it.

Thus, effective management of the Chesapeake Bay must be based on an understanding and an ability to control both point and non-point sources of pollution throughout the Chesapeake Bay basin. It is clear that to achieve this there is a need for the Federal government and the states to work together closely to develop specific management plans that address the regional problems identified by the EPA.

Mr. Chairman, it is clear that the final report of the EPA's Chesapeake Bay Study points to the need for a solution that I hope will begin with the inclusion of my Bay legislation in the reauthorization of the Clean Water Act. It provides the necessary federal incentive, \$10 million in each of the next four fiscal years, to prompt the states in the Chesapeake Bay Basin to devise a comprehensive and effective management plan. In return, the States must commit themselves to pay an amount equal to 45 percent of the total cost, or roughly \$8 million annually over the same time period.

The second event of importance in our efforts to clean up the Bay took place just yesterday in my congressional district, when I hosted some key colleagues of mine from the House of Representatives for a trip on the Bay. These Members represented virtually every area of the country, were both Democrats and Republicans, and all of them demonstrated a keen interest in preserving the Chesapeake Bay.

I took them to my district, which encompasses almost all of the Bay, to give them a first-hand glimpse of the Chesapeake's beauty and the problems it currently faces.

I am pleased to report that the response from this bi-partisan group was enthusiastic for efforts to save the Bay and for my legislation in particular. Tom Bevill of Alabama, Chairman of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Subcommittee, pledged his total support for the initiative, reinforcing his long-standing concern for the Bay. I was also happy that another of my Southern colleagues, Mr. Hammer-schmidt of Arkansas, and a member of this Subcommittee (who is here today), could join me, demonstrating his commitment to saving the nation's largest estuary.

The presence of this group of distinguished legislators, who represent such diverse constituencies, symbolizes the growing national consensus to protect one of our country's greatest natural resources. That same growing consensus is urging passage of H.R. 2817 as a crucial first step in this preservation process. This support complements the regional support for my Bay legislation. Currently the bill is co-sponsored by all members of the Maryland and Virginia Delegations, and over two-thirds of the members from Pennsylvania, three of whom are members of this Subcommittee. In addition, the governors of all three states have publicly endorsed the bill.

Because the Chesapeake Bay is our largest and most productive estuary, the efforts

we make to enrich and preserve it can serve as a model for resolving pollution problems in other estuaries in this country. Dr. Joseph Mihersky, the University of Maryland's top expert on the Chesapeake Bay, who accompanied me yesterday, said, "the whole nation is watching how we handle the Chesapeake Bay. Prompt action to enact policies that will preserve this valuable body of water will be seen as the example of how to reach the necessary consensus in resolving estuary pollution."

Mr. Chairman, I believe that Dr. Mihersky's point is well-taken and coincides with the intent and structure of my Bay legislation. It calls for an effective and creative means of federal-state cost-sharing so as to be realistic in an era of restrained government spending. These funds will be used to deal not only with the Bay itself, but with the river basins that contribute the nutrient run-off that has caused much of the estuary's decline.

Yesterday's trip on the Bay was a historical event because it involved such a broad spectrum of Congressmen who are interested in supporting legislation that will clean up the Bay. Such a development has never happened before with respect to the Chesapeake.

The legislation which I am offering as an amendment to the Clean Water Act has that same unprecedented significance. It is an important first step in restoring and maintaining the Bay's ecological integrity.

I hope that in the future, Mr. Chairman, you and the other members of the Subcommittee will be able to join me for a tour on the Bay so as to acquaint you first-hand with its present beauty and its future needs.

Mrs. James Michener, wife of the author of "Chesapeake," commented yesterday on our trip that saving the Bay is an important and unique way by which we can improve the region's quality of life. I believe that the inclusion of my Bay legislation in this year's reauthorization of the Clean Water Act is the needed first step to insure this much-needed improvement for the citizens of the Chesapeake Bay region.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee, I urge you to include my bill in the Committee's version of the reauthorization of the Clean Water Act. Then we can be certain that we have made the best step in beginning a new era for the Bay. I again want to thank you for your past cooperation and your future consideration. Thank you.●

ALL CIGARETTES ARE DANGEROUS TO OUR NATION'S HEALTH

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1983

● Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share with my colleagues some information I reviewed some time ago concerning the health dangers of cigarette smoking. I rise today also, Mr. Speaker, to urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3979, the Comprehensive Smoking Education Act. I strongly believe this measure is one of the most important health issues before Congress and I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

One of the toughest issues facing Congress is rising health costs. Everywhere we turn, we are faced with health costs endangering our success with inflation, rising health costs pushing the medicare fund to the brink, and rising health costs using more and more of our vital resources. Today, over 10 percent of our GNP goes to medical costs. Yet if we purchased all of the new technologies, if we purchased the best equipment and developed the best techniques and made them available to all, there is no doubt that medical expenses could consume 20, 30, maybe 40 percent of our GNP. The growing crisis of rising health costs has pushed many Members and experts in and out of the health area to look for ways to control health costs. Today, I propose one which has been put forth many times before; but that does not mean it does not make sense today. I urge my fellow Americans to quit smoking.

In recent years, as the evidence of the danger of smoking has grown, some people have turned to low-yield cigarettes as a cure to the problem of smoking. A recent article in the *New England Journal of Medicine* states that while machines used in tests may consume less nicotine with low-yield cigarettes, people do not. For the reasons outlined below, these low-yield cigarettes present as great a threat to people's health as regular cigarettes. I commend to my colleagues this succinct explanation of the situation.

The *New England Journal* article reinforces the call for people to quit smoking. The only way to get people to quit smoking is to convince them of dangers of smoking. And that is why I support H.R. 3979, for it renews the Federal effort to make people aware of the health dangers of smoking. I applaud my colleague, HENRY WAXMAN, for his efforts to recommit Government resources to this noble effort. I implore my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation which is good health policy, good fiscal policy, and good humanitarian policy.

The article follows:

[From the *New England Journal of Medicine*, July 21, 1983]

SMOKERS OF LOW-YIELD CIGARETTES DO NOT CONSUME LESS NICOTINE

NEAL L. BENOWITZ, M.D., SHARON M. HALL, PH.D., RONALD I. HERNING, PH.D., PEYTON JACOB III, PH.D., REESE T. JONES, M.D., AND ABDEL-LATIF OSMAN, M.D.

ABSTRACT: Advertisements suggest that smokers of cigarettes low in nicotine are exposed to less nicotine and tar. Nicotine yields are measured with smoking machines, but machines do not smoke cigarettes as people do. We therefore measured the actual nicotine content of commercial cigarettes with different nicotine and tar yields as determined with smoking machines, and also measured actual nicotine intake as indicated by blood concentrations of its metabolite, cotinine, in 272 subjects smoking various brands of cigarettes.

We found that low-yield cigarette tobacco did not contain less nicotine; in fact, the nicotine concentration in tobacco inversely correlated ($r = -0.53$, $P < 0.05$) with the concentration measured by smoking machines. Blood cotinine concentrations correlated with the number of cigarettes smoked per day but not with the nicotine yield measured by smoking machines. Only 3.8 to 5.0 per cent of total variance in blood cotinine was contributed by nicotine yield.

We conclude that smokers of low-nicotine cigarettes do not consume less nicotine. (*N Engl J Med* 1983; 309:139-42.)

Tobacco advertisements claim that low-yield cigarettes "have" and deliver less tar and nicotine than higher-yield brands. Many physicians advise patients who cannot stop smoking to switch to low-tar, low-nicotine cigarettes, believing that they are safer. However, the figures for nicotine and tar determined with the smoking machines used by U.S. Federal Trade Commission (FTC) and cited by cigarette manufacturers in advertisements are misleading. The FTC values do not reflect what is actually taken into the body of the cigarette smoker.

When measurements of cigarette nicotine and tar yields are determined by a smoking machine, a syringe draws 35-ml puffs each minute until a set length of cigarette is burned. Cigarettes can have low yields in smoking-machine assays for several reasons. The tobacco may be lower in nicotine and may generate less tar. The use of ventilated filters or porous cigarette papers may result in dilution of the tobacco smoke. Papers that burn faster may reduce the time in which the cigarette burns; faster burning means that fewer puffs are taken by the machine to burn a given amount of tobacco. Kozlowski et al. have pointed out that the use of ventilated filters and more rapid burning times can explain much of the reduced yield of currently manufactured cigarettes. The ventilation characteristics of the filter as well as the number of puffs taken before a cigarette is discarded can be controlled to a substantial degree by the way in which the cigarette is held and smoked. Many smokers will alter their smoking behavior, changing the number of cigarettes smoked, the method of puffing, and the depth of inhaling the smoke, to maintain a desired level of nicotine intake. For all these reasons, we questioned whether or not smokers of low-yield cigarettes truly consume less nicotine.

We addressed two questions: What is in the cigarette tobacco—that is, does the tobacco of low-yield cigarettes contain less nicotine? And do the FTC figures predict the actual nicotine intake of smokers? We measured blood concentrations of cotinine as an index of nicotine consumption. Cotinine is the major metabolite of nicotine and persists in the body for a much longer period than nicotine, with a half-life averaging 20 hours (unpublished data). Because of the long half-life, cotinine blood concentrations vary relatively little throughout a day of smoking and thus are a reasonably consistent measure of nicotine exposure.

METHODS

The nicotine content of tobacco from 15 popular brands of cigarettes was measured. Estimates of nicotine delivered by machine ranged from 0.05 to 1.5 mg. Cigarettes were cut to the butt lengths specified in the FTC report of December 1981.⁸ The paper was removed and the tobacco weighed. Nicotine was extracted by heating the tobacco in 20 ml of 1 N hydrochloric acid for one hour in a boiling water bath. After the tubes stood

overnight, they were mixed, and 100- μ l aliquots were removed and diluted with 900 μ l of 0.14 N aqueous ammonia. Nicotine concentrations were measured by high-performance liquid chromatography (Beckman Model 112A pump with a Perkin-Elmer Model LC-15 fixed wavelength detector set at 254 nm). A reverse-phase column was used (Alltech 10 μ C-8), with a mobile phase of 65 percent methanol and 35 percent of an aqueous solution containing 1 percent (vol/vol) 2-methoxyethylamine adjusted to a pH of 8 with acetic acid, at a flow rate of 0.5 ml per minute. The retention time for nicotine was 14.2 minutes. An external aqueous standard of nicotine was used, which gave a linear standard curve over the entire range (0 to 100 μ g per milliliter) of observed concentrations.

Two cigarettes were measured from each pack. The nicotine concentrations of cigarettes from the same pack differed on average by 5.0 percent.

To estimate nicotine intake, blood samples were taken from 272 subjects—122 men and 150 women, with an average age of 37 ± 8 years (S.D.; range, 20 to 56). All subjects were about to begin a smoking-treatment program. Each subject was asked the brand and number of cigarettes he or she smoked in the previous 24 hours. Blood samples for cotinine analysis were drawn at two different times in two subgroups of patients. In Group 1 ($n=149$), the sample was drawn late in the afternoon, usually around 5 p.m. (range, 1:00 to 6:30 p.m.). In Group 2 ($n=123$), the blood sample was drawn at 8 a.m., after 8 to 12 hours of abstinence. Cotinine was measured by gas chromatography with nitrogen-phosphorous detection and a structural analogue of cotinine as the internal standard.⁹

Nicotine content was expressed as a percentage of tobacco weight and also as the total amount of nicotine in the amount of tobacco usually burned in the FTC smoking-machine assay. The relations between the concentration of nicotine in tobacco, total nicotine in a cigarette, and the nicotine delivered by machine were measured by linear regression.

Data on blood cotinine concentrations in Groups 1 and 2 were analyzed separately. Univariate linear regression was used to measure the relation between blood cotinine concentration and age, number of cigarettes smoked per day, machine-determined nicotine yield, and "daily dose" of nicotine (as estimated by the product of number of cigarettes and the yield). Hierarchical multiple linear regression¹⁰ was used to examine the effect of machine nicotine yield on blood cotinine concentration, with control for the effects of age, sex, and number of cigarettes smoked per day.

RESULTS

Cigarette tobacco contained an average of 1.57 ± 0.33 (S.D.) per cent of nicotine. Neither the concentration of nicotine in the tobacco nor the total amount of nicotine in the cigarette correlated positively with the FTC machine-delivery estimate (Fig. 1). In fact, among the cigarette brands sampled, there was a significant inverse correlation between the nicotine concentrations in the tobacco and the nicotine delivered.

Blood cotinine concentrations were significantly correlated with the number of cigarettes smoked by both groups (Fig. 2A). The correlation between machine-determined nicotine yield and blood cotinine concentration was not significant in either group (Fig. 2B). The daily intake of nicotine (number of

cigarettes smoked per day multiplied by the nicotine yield of each cigarette) correlated no better with cotinine concentration ($r = 0.42$ and $r = 0.39$ for Groups 1 and 2, respectively) than with number of cigarettes alone. Multiple regression analysis showed that combination of the variables age, sex, and number of cigarettes per day accounted for 21.2 per cent and 23.3 per cent of the variance in blood cotinine concentration in Groups 1 and 2, respectively. The addition of machine-delivered nicotine yield added only 2.8 per cent and 5.0 per cent to the explained variance in Groups 1 and 2, respectively.

DISCUSSION

Tobacco from low-yield cigarettes does not contain less nicotine than tobacco from higher-yield cigarettes. This is probably well known to the tobacco industry, but to our knowledge, it has not been discussed in the medical literature. The main determinants of whether a cigarette has a low or a high yield in machine testing are the characteristics of its ventilation and burning. Both these variables are under the control of the cigarette smoker and allow considerable variation in nicotine intake. We also found that people who wanted to stop smoking and who were smoking low-yield cigarettes did not consume less nicotine, as judged by blood cotinine concentration, than smokers of higher-yield cigarettes.

Blood cotinine concentration is not a perfect marker of nicotine consumption, because of individual variability in both the conversion of nicotine to cotinine and the elimination rate of cotinine itself. But we have no reason to think that there is any relation between the rate or pattern of nicotine or cotinine metabolism and the brand of cigarette smoked that would cause our data to be biased.

Our findings are consistent with other reports that only a small percentage of the variance in blood nicotine concentrations is accounted for by machine-determined nicotine yield. Rickert and Robinson also reported no correlation between machine-determined nicotine yield and plasma cotinine concentrations. But their subjects included few smokers of low-nicotine cigarettes (<0.7 mg). In contrast, in our study population the full range of cigarette brands was encompassed.

We focused on nicotine intake from smoking different cigarette brands. Nicotine is suspected of having a role in morbidity and mortality from coronary heart disease, but its quantitative importance has not been established. For example, a recent study showed that the risk of myocardial infarction increased with the number of cigarettes smoked but did not differ between smokers of low-yield cigarettes and those of high-yield cigarettes. Our data partly explain this observation.

In contrast, there is evidence implicating exposure to carbon monoxide and tar as a cause of disease. Other investigators have reported that carbon monoxide levels are no different in smokers of low-yield cigarettes and smokers of higher-yield cigarettes. This was also true in our subjects. There are no markers of tar consumption in people. In smoking-machine assays, low-yield cigarettes deliver a lower ratio of tar to nicotine than do higher-yield cigarettes; however, it is not established that this observation holds when cigarettes are smoked by people. It may be that the ratio of tar intake to nicotine intake is lower when low-yield cigarettes are smoked. However, since the intake of nicotine is not substantially affected by

the brand of cigarette, the quantitative benefit (if there is any) in terms of reduced tar intake is obviously far less than suggested by cigarette advertisements.

Perhaps the smokers who participated in our study and were seeking treatment consumed more nicotine or were more dependent on it than other smokers. If so, they were more likely to regulate their nicotine intake independently of the type of cigarette they smoked. In contrast, lighter smokers who switch to low-yield cigarettes may, in fact, consume less nicotine. Although this possibility cannot be discounted, our subjects were representative of smokers who for whatever reasons cannot stop smoking without professional help. We think that in the case of the habitual smoker for whom cutting down on nicotine and tar intake is considered to be medically important, it is unlikely that changing the brand of cigarette will accomplish this goal.

In summary, we found that the tobacco in low-yield cigarettes does not "contain" less nicotine than higher-yield cigarettes and that smokers of these cigarettes do not consume less nicotine. The FTC cigarette-testing data do not predict nicotine intake by the cigarette smoker. Advertisements from cigarette manufacturers suggesting that smokers of low-yield cigarettes will be exposed to less tar and nicotine are misleading. Patients who smoke cigarettes should be so advised. ●

SPELTS DISTINGUISHED NEBRASKAN

HON. VIRGINIA SMITH

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1983

● Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the Nebraska State Historical Society on October 5 honored Richard E. Spelts, Jr., with the 1983 Distinguished Nebraskan Award. Dick Spelts is a man who has made a difference in Nebraska as the following speech by former-U.S. Senator Carl Curtis documents. His life of service to his community, State, and country should be an example to us all and I commend to my colleagues Senator Curtis' remarks on Dick Spelts.

The remarks follow:

SPEECH OF CARL T. CURTIS AT WASHINGTON, D.C., ON OCTOBER 5, 1983 PRESENTING THE DISTINGUISHED NEBRASKAN AWARD TO RICHARD E. (DICK) SPELTS, JR.

To our honored guest, Richard Spelts may I say you are a distinguished Nebraskan. You have already attained that rank by your outstanding accomplishments and your many services to your fellow man.

Our honoree has been recognized by many organizations. I shall mention only a few of them. In 1952 Dick Spelts received the Junior Chamber of Commerce Distinguished Service Award. In 1958 the University of Nebraska presented him with the Alumni Service Award. The Boy Scouts of America in 1962 presented him with the Silver Beaver Award and the next year he received the Mr. Grand Island Award. In 1965 he was given the American Cancer Society Award. The Wisdom Society presented him with the Wisdom Award of Honor in 1975 and the Hall County Housing Author-

ity in 1979 presented him with the Golden Service Award. In 1980 he was named Nebraska's Outstanding Conservationist of the Year and in that same year was named the Nebraskan of the Month and also in 1980 he received the Nature Conservancy-Recognition Award.

If any one wishes to learn more about Dick Spelts please be advised that he is listed in the following publications: Who's Who in the United States; Who's Who in the Midwest; World Who's Who in Finance & Industry; International Who's Who in Community Service; Who's Who in Nebraska; Personalities of the West and Midwest; Dictionary of International Biography; The National Register of Prominent Americans; Men of Achievement; Community Leaders and Noteworthy Americans; Personalities of America; and The Directory of Notable Americans.

Dick Spelts is President and CEO of The First National Bank of Grand Island, Spelts of Nebraska, Bankshares of Nebraska, and a Life Insurance Company of Phoenix, Arizona. He is Chairman and Officer or a Director in nine other Nebraska corporations. He is a Director of the MEI Corporation of Minneapolis, Minnesota, the Northwestern Public Service Company of Huron, South Dakota and the Business Development Corporation of Lincoln, Nebraska. He has served as an officer or director of the Alexander Hamilton Life Insurance Company of Detroit, Michigan and the Investors Life Insurance Company of Sioux Falls, South Dakota.

Dick Spelts hasn't spent all of his time in business. Presently he is involved as a trustee, chairman or director of the following organizations: Hastings College Board; Grand Island Charitable Foundation; University of Nebraska Foundation; 7.5 Million Dollar Platte River Maintenance Trust; Nebraska Association of Commerce & Industry; St. Francis Medical Center Foundation; Grand Island Area Zoological Society (Children's Zoo); Stuhler Museum Foundation and National Council—Boy Scouts of America.

Richard Spelts has served his country as a member of our armed forces. He served in World War II, in the United States Navy with the rank of Lieutenant (J.G.). He is a political leader, who has served his party in many capacities, including a major role in electing and re-electing your speaker to the United States Senate.

His past civic activities are many and I will mention a few: Presidential Representative to Kingdom of Tonga Centennial U.S. Public Delegate—UNESCO Conference; Nebraska State Chamber of Commerce; Grand Island Chamber of Commerce; Rotary Club; Overland Trails Boy Scout Council; Hastings College Alumni Association; University of Nebraska Regional Alumni; Nebraska Cancer Crusade; Grand Island Industrial Foundation; Nebraska Tax Research Council; Nebraska Independent College Foundation; United States Chamber of Commerce Airline and the Nebraska Diplomats.

We are very pleased that Dick's family is here to join in this happy occasion. We honor Dick's lovely wife and loyal helpmate Dorothy for her contribution to Dick's many activities and accomplishments. And we are happy to welcome their daughters Connie and Susan and their husbands.

There are some very special things that I would like to tell you about Dick. May I suggest to this audience that you picture a beautiful church in the city of Grand Island, a house of worship designed to glorify our heavenly Father and to perpetuate

the faith and to meet the needs of a congregation of nearly 1,400 children, young people, adults and senior citizens. This church just didn't appear overnight by magic. It is because during the 1950's Dick Spelts served in a dual role as Secretary of the Finance Committee charged with the responsibility of raising the necessary funds to construct a new church, and Chairman of the Board of Trustees charged with the responsibility of selling the old church, arranging for the construction, interim financing and the long term financing of the new church. The Building Committee purchased a 10 acre sight and built one of the most beautiful churches in the State of Nebraska. This church structure was Dedicated in 1955 with Dick Spelts acting for the congregation receiving the keys from the contractor. Dick and Dorothy Spelts have both been Officers in the church, and Dick was elected to serve as Chairman of the Centennial Committee of the church which celebrated its 100 years in 1969. He has also served as Chairman of the Board of Trustees, Synod of Nebraska.

The Sisters of St. Francis maintain a modern well-equipped hospital and medical center for the care of the ill in the Grand Island area. Those in charge of St. Francis knew well that Dick Spelts was indeed a distinguished individual. They reached out beyond the members of their own denomination and drafted Dick Spelts to help with the planning, financing and completion of that fine new medical center which was dedicated in 1978. It was his responsibility to work with the administration, architects and bonding companies and arrange for the interim and permanent financing of that medical center. He served as a director for eight years and during that time provided the leadership which brought about the construction of the new medical center. Dick Spelts was President of the Board of Directors during three of the years of planning and construction. During that time he attended an average of three meetings per week at the hospital. The Executive Director of the St. Francis Medical Center wrote, "We were very short of money and I don't believe we would have been able to accomplish this project without his leadership. He is a very outstanding businessman with great decision making ability."

Dick Spelts was Co-chairman for the largest bond issue vote drive in the history of Grand Island. The Committee used Dick and his unique ability for organization and the bond issue carried in every precinct in the District. That bond issue resulted in the fine facility for the Grand Island Senior High School, and helped win the first All America City Award for Grand Island.

The senior citizens have a dedicated friend in our distinguished honoree. For more than a quarter of a century he served as Chairman of the Grand Island Housing Authority which developed and operated the Golden Age Village. It was organized in order to convert a run down war housing facility into an installation which would be an asset to the community. Over a number of years they were able to convert the 36 acres into an area which provides dignified homes and apartments for low income, elderly residents of the community, an All-Faiths Chapel, District Offices for Boy Scouts of America, headquarters for the United Way, headquarters for the Girl Scouts Council, a Children's Village which is a holding home for temporary wards of the Court, and there they established the first modern Nursing Home in Mid-Nebraska.

Dick's long time pastor, the Reverend John Shell writes, "Dick Spelts is a man who has a tremendously brilliant executive ability, deals well with people and knows how to get things done in a fast and efficient manner. He has used those God-given talents very freely in service to people, organizations, and the church. With all his gifts, he has maintained a humble and gracious spirit which has made him a friend to people in all walks of life."

Now Dick, in order to keep you humble, I want you to know that I interviewed your severest critics in both business and politics all across Nebraska. It took me considerable time to do this, but I finally located both of them. Each of them said that they had concluded that you were right and they had long since forgiven you. It is a happy task, which is mine, to proclaim the recognition of Richard E. (Dick) Spelts, Jr. as a distinguished Nebraskan.●

A TRIBUTE TO AL ANGRISANI

HON. JIM COURTER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1983

● Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to take note of the achievements of one of my constituents, Mr. Al Angrisani, who entered Government service and successfully took up the challenge of streamlining Government operations and saving money for the taxpayer.

During the first 2 years of the Reagan administration, there have been few, if any, Federal agencies that have experienced as much positive change, or seen as many concrete accomplishments, as the Department of Labor's Employment and Training Administration. Assistant Secretary Angrisani did something that others have talked about doing for years—he proved that business expertise and methods could be successfully applied to the management of a large Federal agency.

When Assistant Secretary Angrisani came to the Employment and Training Administration, he found a bureaucracy that was too big, too cumbersome, and too hard to control.

Under his direction, ETA underwent an amazing turnaround.

When Assistant Secretary Angrisani arrived at ETA, he found some 650 unresolved audits with questioned costs of more than \$300 million. Some of these audits had been unresolved for up to 7 years. A cumbersome process was being used for audit resolution and debt collection. Its objective appeared to be the bilking of the taxpayer by assuring that legitimate debts went unpaid.

He found that up to \$400 million a year was being spent through a national office discretionary account, with much of it being used for last minute or nonspecific, sole source contracts on research unrelated to the Nation's training needs. It was an exam-

ple of "business as usual" in the buddy system that had come to characterize the procurement system of many agencies.

Working with the Labor Department's Office of the Inspector General, he moved swiftly to correct these deficiencies and lay the cornerstone for proper program and financial accountability by instituting a program of cost control.

The first steps were to establish a tracking system for audits and to eliminate the ETA resolution backlog.

A program was set in place to bring the audit backlog from 650 to zero, where it remains, even with expanded audit coverage.

In addition, cash control management was extended to include:

Cash drawdown management, in which program sponsors were required to return cash balances in excess of their needs—some \$86 million was recaptured by this method in fiscal year 1982.

Debt collection, where funds were collected from program sponsors after issuance of a final audit determination—this resulted in the return of more than \$14 million to the Treasury in fiscal year 1982.

Contract closeout, where some \$31 million was returned to the Treasury in fiscal year 1982 by emphasizing proper and prompt closeout and grant settlements with contractors and grantees.

In total, more than \$132 million was returned to the Treasury in fiscal year 1982, a truly admirable and praiseworthy achievement.

One of the major programs at ETA when Assistant Secretary Angrisani arrived was the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act, or CETA. It was a program that had lost sight of its purpose; one that was bloated by too many resources dedicated to too many objectives—objectives often loosely defined. At its peak, about \$9 billion a year was being spent through 476 prime sponsors and 55,000 subcontractors. Because the system was largely unaudited, accountability was near zero, and the program became known for its abuses of the public's funds.

Under Assistant Secretary Angrisani's leadership, ETA developed and implemented the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA), which replaced CETA as of October 1, 1983.

JTPA is designed to train 1 million individuals each year to provide them with marketable skills that will put them in self-sustaining, private sector jobs. It is a realistic, workable method of dealing with employment and training. It deserves our continued support. In fact, if I might quote from a Washington Post editorial of October 5:

... the new approach has promise and it deserves the bipartisan support that it has enjoyed, so far, in Congress.

JTPA is the forerunner of programs that reject the old ways of paternalistic government. It is the first true test of private/public partnerships as an alternative to big social programs, and will serve as a model for future partnerships. It ushers in a new era in which private/public partnerships will share the responsibility for dealing with our social problems.

Speaking to a gathering of employees at the Department of Labor on October 5 of this year, President Reagan said:

The people up here on the dais, other people in the Administration and the Congress, and many of you in the audience—especially you in the Employment and Training Administration—played a role in making this positive program happen. From a personal perspective, this Act represents the change of direction I hoped to bring to Washington when I came here. And I want to thank all of you for your assistance in bringing it about. I'm very proud of your work.

The development and implementation of such a program is a Herculean undertaking—Assistant Secretary Angrisani and his staff at ETA performed above and beyond the call.

In addition, ETA:

Saved up to \$850 million in fiscal year 1983 benefit outlays by designing and obtaining major legislative reforms to the extended benefit program and the Trade Adjustment Act.

Consolidated and improved the ETA contracting function and established long-term safeguards to protect the integrity of the procurement function.

Reduced the reporting burden on program sponsors by 3.5 million hours in fiscal year 1982.

Completed a major reorganization of the ETA National Office that reduced the number of organizational units by 40 percent and eliminated many unnecessary, high-paid positions.

Accomplished all this and more while reducing ETA employment from 3,333 to 2,281—32 percent.

Quite an enviable record.

The performance of Assistant Secretary Angrisani and his staff at ETA reflect the Reagan administration's philosophy of streamlining the operations of the Federal Government. They have proved that you can cut out a lot of fat and still have an efficient, in fact a more effective, operation.

Assistant Secretary Angrisani deserves the thanks and congratulations of not only the Members of the House of Representatives, but of all Americans who oppose the wasting of our precious tax dollars.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.●

WORLD FOOD DAY

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1983

● Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, a World Food Day observance was held October 14 at the Department of Agriculture as part of the worldwide movement to reaffirm dedication to the goal of wiping out hunger. It is appropriate that we use this and other occasions to stress the high priority we attach to this task.

Tragically, as many as a half billion people of the world are estimated today to be suffering from lack of sufficient food. The malnourishment stunts their lives and leads to early death. Fortunately, the knowledge and means are at hand to alleviate this massive hunger—if we have the will, and the persistence, to do it.

The United States, I am pleased to say, continues to be a leader in this effort. And we in the Congress have periodic opportunities to contribute directly in this campaign with our votes on legislation.

One important congressionally funded program is Public Law 480, the food-for-peace program, under which we send U.S. agricultural commodities to needy persons abroad. Perhaps even more important to the war on hunger over the longer term is our technical and developmental assistance that helps developing countries to become eventually self-sufficient in food. A pending measure due for House consideration early in November, H.R. 2992, the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1983, has as one of its major components an authorization for continued substantial technical and developmental programs for poor countries in agriculture, rural development, and nutrition during fiscal years 1984 and 1985.

The World Food Day commemoration held at USDA had as its theme, appropriately enough, "Helping Others to Help Themselves." The gathering was addressed by distinguished leaders including Secretary of Agriculture John R. Block and M. Peter McPherson, Administrator of the Agency for International Development.

Following are the texts of their remarks:

REMARKS BY AGRICULTURE SECRETARY JOHN R. BLOCK

I'm happy to have this opportunity to welcome you to the U.S. Government's official commemoration of World Food Day 1983.

President Reagan has officially proclaimed October 16 as World Food Day, as recommended by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. Millions of Americans in thousands of communities throughout the country have been participating in activities all week. The widespread response to World Food Day

here, and abroad, reflects a deep concern by all involved.

And it should be that way.

The United States is deeply committed to improving the supply of wholesome and nutritious food for people in every nation, our own included. We want to help ensure that all people are able to achieve a proper diet.

In practical terms, our commitment has meant considerable support for nations in need. The Eisenhower Food for Peace program, which was launched in 1954, has provided hundreds of millions of tons of farm products—more than \$40 billion worth in all.

We have sent more than 4,000 agricultural experts to developing nations to help them improve their agricultural systems. We have provided training for more than 70,000 foreign agricultural students. And we have freely shared the results of our extensive agricultural research worldwide.

This has helped developing nations increase their food production somewhat faster than their population growth during the past 10 years. The quality of diet, measured by consumption of calories, has also improved.

Unfortunately, the improvements have not been shared equally by all developing countries, nor by all people. The Food and Agriculture Organization estimates that as many as 500 million people are existing on subpar diets, with large numbers concentrated in Africa.

As a member of the World Food Council, we have vigorously supported that body's initiatives to help developing countries design and carry out national food sector strategies. These efforts have helped governments link farm policies with food policies, giving development a more realistic framework within which to function.

As a result, the food sector strategies of an increasing number of countries wisely give more attention to the importance of providing strong incentives for farmers.

Africa is a special case, of course, with special problems. Yet, we know that solving those problems is much more complex than simply pouring in food. Storage, transportation, distribution and pricing problems often conspire to prevent food from getting to those who need it most. At the same time, we have to make certain our assistance does not undermine agricultural development in the recipient countries.

For the short term, the Department of Agriculture is searching for ways to make the P.L. 480 Food for Peace program more responsive to the needs of Africa and other developing countries.

For the long term, if the objective of genuine world food security is to be achieved, then the concept of comparative advantage is going to have to prevail. By that, I mean countries should produce those commodities they can produce economically and buy the rest from countries who can produce at more reasonable prices.

I believe countries need to identify and concentrate on crops they can grow efficiently and economically. Those nations with the appropriate technology should provide all possible assistance. It will continue to be the policy of the United States to share our agricultural technology unselfishly with food-deficit developing nations.

On this World Food Day, the world community can be certain that the United States will not falter in seeking to strengthen the bonds between developing and developed countries. We will work in support of other nations so that they can be stable,

open, productive, prosperous and oriented towards a free-market economy. Among such nations the United States will find its strongest friends, allies and trading partners.

My best wishes to you all.

REMARKS BY AID ADMINISTRATOR M. PETER McPHERSON

Good morning! It is an honor to be here and I want to commend each of you for the role you have played in making World Food Day a reality.

A.I.D.'s world mission is dealing with Hunger and I would like to concentrate my remarks today on Africa, a country where the hunger problem is so great.

For the past two decades, per capita agricultural production in Africa has declined—the only continent of the world where that is true. Accordingly, the major thrust of our foreign aid programs for Africa is now to increase Africa's agricultural production. Among other things, urging countries to pay their farmers reasonable prices for their products.

U.S.D.A. works with A.I.D. in international agricultural programs. For example, U.S.D.A. often provides skilled technicians not available anywhere else. We are also working closely with the Peace Corps. The results of this fruitful partnership are reflected in the progress some countries in Africa are making in improving their agricultural capabilities.

We are beginning to see solid progress in some countries where the necessary policy changes are being taken, countries like the Sudan, Mali, and Zambia. Nonetheless, the pace of change is slow and we need to keep working at it.

One of the major ways we are achieving success is through use of the U.S.'s abundant agricultural production to help countries in Africa increase their own production.

By using Title III and Title II, Section 206, A.I.D. has taken the lead in creating programs that achieve significant policy reforms and development. We are intent on putting in place more of these high quality and effective programs, particularly in Africa. We believe they offer a realistic and effective mechanism to deal with the increasingly difficult problem of food availability.

In the shorter term, however, Africa's need for imported food is often intensified because of the impact of weather and other disasters. The U.S. has a long-standing tradition of responding generously to these emergency needs. In 1983, for example, when the U.S. supplied more than \$250 million of food aid to Africa, one-sixth of that was for emergency feeding programs. We are proud that the United States has taken the lead in meeting Africa's emergency food needs. This fine, humanitarian tradition to alleviate the problems of people around the world will continue. In 1984, we anticipate there will be increased needs for emergency food shipments to Africa. The U.S. Government has already approved a number of emergency programs in Africa. And members of my staff are, at this moment, en route to meetings with other donors and international organizations to discuss the nature of and solutions to the problems in a number of countries. I am optimistic we will continue to respond to the true emergency situations Africa will face in the years ahead. At the same time we need to continue to strike the right balance between relief, market development, and economic develop-

ment for P.L. 480 programs. All have important roles.

In my travels I have met many people around the world—many of them poor, uneducated, plagued by disease, hungry and malnourished. The one thing that has impressed me the most is their spirit and their capacity for hope. Hope for a better life for themselves and their children. The world needs to continue to provide aid for the desperate. But, we should never forget that real dignity for individuals anywhere requires the opportunity to develop the skills and earn the income which is the real long-term answer to hunger.

With the continued efforts of thousands of Americans, hope for the poor is well-founded.

Working together, we have the capacity to overcome hunger in the world. It is a commitment we must make for ourselves and the world's future generations.●

CHILDREN AS TEACHERS OF PEACE WEEK

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1983

● Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, today, Congressman BILL GREEN and I introduced a resolution which would designate the week beginning September 18, 1984, as "Children as Teachers of Peace Week." The United Nations has declared the third Tuesday of September as the International Day of Peace, and has encouraged commemoration "through all means of education." In the spirit of the promotion of peace, this resolution sets aside a week to listen to what America's young people have to say about peace and war.

Young people begin to take in images of peace and war by the age of five or six. While they can hardly grasp these images initially, they are nonetheless present and begin to affect children. The issue for us to decide is not whether or not we wish young people to know about these issues, but rather whether we listen to their concerns and share our knowledge with them.

Ursell Austin, 16 years old, recently shared her views with the House Select Committee on Children, Youth and Families:

The schools I went to never talked about nuclear weapons . . . or the arms race . . . It's not like we don't hear about nuclear weapons. It's on the news, it's in the papers, it's on television. But people act like we aren't supposed to talk about it. I think about the bomb just about every day now. It makes me sad and depressed when I think about a bomb ever being dropped. I hope I'm with my family. I don't want to die alone. I think about it most on sunny days when I'm having a good time. I think—it could happen right now . . . It scares me about my future. I get angry when I think about maybe not being able to have a career; that my plans just wouldn't get a chance to ever happen . . . It makes me wonder whether I should have kids at all.

I'd be so scared for my baby. I want to live longer, but at least I've had this long . . .

Ursell Austin is not unique among young people in her reflections about peace and war. Studies by Dr. John Mack, professor of psychiatry at Harvard Medical School, have shown that adolescents are very worried about the prospects of nuclear war occurring between the United States and the Soviet Union. In another survey, with a representative cross-section of 913 teenagers, Dr. John Goldenring, junior fellow of the American Academy of Pediatrics, concluded that over half of the teens surveyed believe that there will be a nuclear war with the Soviet Union in their lifetime, and 9 percent were certain that it would happen. We are facing a very serious problem with our young people. Over half of those surveyed by Dr. Goldenring said that they had never had an opportunity to talk with any adults about their fears. Young people are apparently filling this communication gap with despair and unwarranted fantasies, instead of with information and hope.

"Children as Teachers of Peace Week" is a time to begin to address the enormous problem we face. During this week, we envision school activities—art, speech and writing contests—whereby young people on the elementary and secondary levels can share their views on peace and what world leaders should do to bring about peace in the world. We also envision student participation in related citywide events. This opportunity will engender open discussion on a topic which may adults feel uncomfortable bringing out into the open.

Studies have demonstrated that young people derive considerable psychological gain from openness and accurate information. As Members of Congress, we can do much to facilitate this process. Please join us in this effort.●

THE VOCATIONAL TECHNICAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1983

HON. MARGE ROUKEMA

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1983

● Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, today, I am pleased to join as an original cosponsor of the Vocational Technical Education Act of 1983, which extends the authorization for the Federal vocational education programs through fiscal year 1987. The work of the gentleman from Kentucky, Education and Labor Committee Chairman CARL PERKINS, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WILLIAM F. GOODLING), the ranking Republican on the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education,

is to be commended and I look forward to working with them in the coming weeks as the subcommittee begins consideration of this important measure.

First and foremost among the improvements in the bill is the increased involvement of the private sector in the programs. This appears throughout the bill, but is principally achieved through the requirement that private sector representatives constitute a majority of the membership of State and local vocational education advisory councils. In my opinion, the bill does not go far enough because it does not require the councils to approve the plans. As the subcommittee proceeds in its deliberations on the bill, I intend to pursue this question. This is similar to what we provided for the Federal job training programs under the Job Training Partnership Act and there has been little or no disagreement that this approach insures relevance to the job market needs of the States and localities. In addition, it builds necessary confidence in the programs among the business community.

In addition, the bill expands private sector involvement by providing for an increased focus on customized training—training which involves an employer in the planning and conduct of the training. Customized training achieves a maximum level of private sector involvement in vocational education and training because the employer actually has a stake in the success of the training and, most importantly, has a job ready for the trainee upon successful completion of training.

Section 306 authorizes the Secretary of Education to conduct demonstration programs for customized training, with the recipients of the grants required to pay 25 percent of the costs of the program. In addition, the adult training provisions contained in title II, part F of the bill will result in increased instances of customized training, since these are specifically permitted.

Another significant improvement in the bill is the removal of a number of required set-asides in the State basic grants. These set-asides have inhibited flexibility at the State level in addressing the State's individual needs. Unfortunately, the bill goes one step further in establishing each of these set-asides as a separate categorical program administered at the Federal level. This does subject them to annual congressional control over funding levels, but it is an unfortunate reversal of the recent trend toward halting the proliferation of categorical Federal programs.

The element of the bill most clearly in need of revision is the funding level. It is absurd to provide for a doubling of the funding of these programs while we are still confronted with exorbitant deficits. In part, this increase

is prompted by the categorization which I have just discussed, which is yet another reason not to categorize. I am hopeful that, in taking up this bill, the House will provide for more realistic funding levels, either by lowering the amounts or by simply authorizing such sums as are necessary.

Clearly, there is room for improvement in the bill. However, with the vocational education programs expiring at the end of this year, it is essential that we begin work as soon as possible. I am encouraged by this beginning.●

DAIRY COMPROMISE

HON. AL SWIFT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1983

● Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I voted no to sending the compromise dairy bill to conference committee. I did this not as a condemnation of the compromise bill, but to protect the right of the House to try to improve this bill for the family dairy farmer.

I recognize the need for new dairy legislation and want to commend Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. JEFFORDS, and their staff for their tireless work during the past years to reach an accord that will work throughout the country. Because this legislation is so very important to dairy farmers throughout the country, I feel that the House should have a chance to debate this bill.

I supported several amendments that in my opinion would make this bill stronger. One of these amendments was to extend the diversion program from 15 months to 24 months, which would make this legislation co-terminus with the 4-year farm bill and give the dairy farmer more incentive to participate in this program. I was very upset that I and the other Members of the House would have had no opportunity to try to improve this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage the leadership to bring this issue to the floor as soon as possible for a full and open debate so that the dairy farmers of this Nation can make solid plans for their future.●

SISTER HENRIETTA, A PIONEER FOR THE POOR

HON. MARY ROSE OAKAR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1983

● Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, the death of Sister Henrietta comes as a shock to Ohioans; not because her death was a surprise—sister was 81 years old and recuperating from a heart ailment—but because the people

of my district and the rest of Ohio can see around them the benefits of the exemplary work which Sister Henrietta did for the poor.

Clevelanders will remember Sister Henrietta most for her work in improving the housing conditions in the Hough area. But long before that, she made her mark as supervisor of surgery at Mercy Hospital and later as hospital administrator. Under her administration, the hospital acquired an old estate and increased the 229-bed facility to its current size of 547 beds. The hospital is now known to all Ohioans as Timken Mercy Medical Center. Recently, sister received the honor of having an ambulatory-care center at Timken Mercy named after her—the Sister Henrietta Gorris Clinic.

Cleveland will long remember sister Henrietta as the "Pioneer for the Poor." I will miss her greatly.●

TRIBUTE TO LECH WALESA

HON. GERALDINE A. FERRARO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 6, 1983

● Ms. FERRARO. Mr. Speaker, The Nobel Prize awarded to Lech Walesa has special significance to the world. This award recognizes Walesa's accomplishments as the leader of the Communist world's only independent labor union, and also shows the world's support for the continuation of his struggle for workers' rights in Poland.

The Nobel citation said that Walesa's activities have "been characterized by a determination to solve his country's problems through negotiation and cooperation without resorting to violence." This modest man rallied his fellow workers to stand up against the might of the Soviet Union. This charismatic leader provided a ray of hope to the 10 million members of Poland's outlawed Solidarity movement.

Lech Walesa inspired millions of Poles. He inspired us with his great courage as he worked to improve the lives of his fellow workers and their families. He used peaceful means in the struggle for economic justice in Poland.

I am cosponsoring a resolution paying tribute to Walesa's dedicated work for the people of Poland. The Nobel Peace Prize reminds us never to forget the ideals behind Solidarity's struggle.

Lech Welesa has installed hope in us all.●

TRIBUTE TO ANNA GEAR

HON. HERBERT H. BATEMAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1983

● Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Speaker, this Saturday, the city of Hampton, Va., in America's first district, will mark the homecoming of one of her finest residents.

Mrs. Anna Gear has become a temporary resident of Indianapolis, Ind. and the world as she has taken office as the national president of the American Legion Auxiliary, a national organization of over 1 million mothers, wives, sisters, daughters, and granddaughters of Legionnaires and deceased veterans. Since taking office in August she has traveled widely on behalf of the auxiliary and Saturday will be her first visit back to her proud hometown.

Anna Gear has carried impeccable credentials into her role as auxiliary president. She has been a member of the auxiliary since the age of 17 after she married her husband, Thomas J. Gear, a Navy veteran of World War Two. She has served as a volunteer at the local Veteran's hospital. She has been president of her unit, president of the Virginia auxiliary and has chaired several committees in the national organization.

As she travels to every State in the Union and to a number of foreign countries over the coming year, her husband will be understanding and supportive of her efforts for the auxiliary. Thomas Gear has distinguished himself with the American Legion as a past commander of the Department of Virginia, as a national executive committeeman, and by his service as mayor of the city of Hampton.

During her term as president, Mrs. Gear will be especially devoted to two important auxiliary projects.

First, she will spearhead an effort to raise \$60,000 for the purchase of an irrigation system for an orphanage in Mexico. The irrigation system is badly needed for the garden tended by the more than 1,000 children that live at the orphanage.

In addition to this humanitarian project, Mrs. Gear hopes to establish a national convention for junior members of the auxiliary. As Mrs. Gear says:

If we have no more wars, they are the future of the organization. We are a dying organization without war—and we hope that will happen. We will have a junior national convention, elect a national president for the juniors. In that way we will prepare them to take over the organization.

To raise money for the expense of sending delegates to the convention, Mrs. Gear designed a special china plate bearing Mrs. Gear's slogan:

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

"Hats off to America" and bearing her creed: "Let us stand together with renewed confidence in our cause—united in our heritage and in our hopes for the future."

I believe Mrs. Gear's words are a sentiment that all Americans should share and I am calling on this House to join me in paying special tribute to Anna Gear and both of her families: her husband and children and the members of the American Legion Auxiliary throughout the United States.●

DON AND MARGE RIDGEWAY**HON. ROBERT J. MRAZEK**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1983

● Mr. MRAZEK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to two residents of my congressional district, Don and Marge Ridgeway, whose presence have been felt in their local community of Northport, Long Island for the past 10 years. It is my privilege to bring the accomplishments of the Ridgeways to the attention of my colleagues in the U.S. Congress.

Don and Marge Ridgeway have enriched the lives of others as volunteers at the Veterans' Administration Medical Center in Northport. The importance of providing volunteer service to veterans who have proudly served their country in this century's four wars must not be underestimated. As Mrs. Ridgeway has so clearly pointed out, "the most important thing volunteers can bring is themselves. The patient thinks, 'You cared enough to come here and talk to me.' Everything else is secondary."

In today's increasingly impersonal society, it is truly comforting to know that there are still people like Don and Marge Ridgeway who have been willing to commit a large part of their lives to caring for others. The Ridgeways not only volunteer their own services, but actively recruit others to become volunteers. Mrs. Ridgeway often travels throughout Long Island to speak to various organizations on the gratification of giving volunteer service at the VA hospital.

Having served as an officer in the Army Corps of Engineers before, during, and after World War II, Don Ridgeway's military background has enabled him to develop an excellent and easy-going rapport with the veterans he helps. Marge Ridgeway first became a Red Cross volunteer in 1942 and maintained her involvement with the organization for the next 20 years while her husband served at various posts in the United States, Germany, and Panama.

Settling in Northport, the Ridgeways soon volunteered at the VA hos-

pital. Today, Don Ridgeway is in charge of the hospital's Vet Van program and has organized volunteer teams to operate it every day of the week. The Vet Van transports patients who must travel to receive medical care and is often used in the afternoons to take patients on excursions to the beach, museums, and other points of interest in the Island. In 1978, Marge Ridgeway was appointed national Red Cross representative at the hospital, and is now responsible for initiating new programs and recruiting volunteers.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to represent these fine people in Congress. In the world we live in today, there is no substitute for the love and attention the Ridgeways have given to a countless number of veterans who so richly deserve our support. I trust that they will continue their exemplary service to the community for many more years.●

SAYING NO TO HIGHER MEDICAL COSTS**HON. RON WYDEN**

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1983

● Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, October 24, 1983, the Health and Environment Subcommittee will hold a hearing on H.R. 2956, the Preferred Provider Health Care Act. On May 9 of this year, I introduced this legislation and several members of the health subcommittee including the gentleman from Colorado, (Mr. WIRTH), the gentleman from New York, (Mr. OTTINGER), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ECKART), the gentleman from Minnesota, (Mr. SIKORSKI), and the gentleman from New York, (Mr. SCHEUER) have joined me as co-sponsors.

Preferred provider organizations (PPO's), are an exciting newcomer to the health care field and in preparation for the upcoming hearing, I would like to provide some brief background information on PPO's to the Members.

Mr. Speaker, after years of debate, scores of experts, and numerous task forces, we seem further than ever from being able to reign in soaring health care costs, which totaled over \$300 million last year alone.

Yet, in a few communities across the country a new cost-saving medical plan has sparked fresh hope that medical costs can be controlled and high quality maintained. This new approach is the preferred provider organization.

Preferred provider organizations are alternative health care financing arrangements in which services of some specified list of providers—hospitals, doctors, and so forth—are offered to employers, union trust plans, insurers

and others at predetermined rates, generally below the norm.

All of the key groups essential to our health care system—consumers, providers, employers and insurers—can gain from participating in a PPO.

For patients, in addition to the rate breaks and the right to choose one's own physician, PPO's provide information, prior to treatment, about how much they will pay—and in most instances, if a patient sees a preferred provider this amount is accepted as payment in full.

For health care providers, in addition to the guarantees of a significant volume of patients and reimbursement on the traditional fee for services basis, start up costs can be small and reimbursement prompt—often within 10 days. There is not much paperwork, physicians can get involved at little financial risk, and administrative costs tend to be as low as 6 percent.

Employers who participate in PPO's get cost savings and an improved benefit package to offer to their employees. A PPO can be added to private insurance plans at the request of business or labor, or it can be implemented directly by business and labor through a self-insured system.

Insurers who participate in PPO's get a competitive product that can be attached to existing benefit plans.

With all the acronyms floating around in the health care marketplace—PPO's, IPA's, HMO's—it may be difficult to distinguish one from another but there are two major differences which distinguish PPO's from prepaid group practice arrangements, or HMO's.

Consumers in a PRO arrangement are not locked in, they retain the freedom to go to any doctor they choose, although they pay regular rates or receive less generous benefits if they decide not to use preferred providers.

In addition, unlike an HMO arrangement, doctors and other providers in PPO's are paid on a fee for service basis.

Creative employers, unions, and insurers are finding that PPO plans can produce impressive results.

In California, a PPO "prudent buyer" plan of hospital services has been negotiated for the six population centers of the State. According to the plan's administrator, in spite of the fact that hospital costs rose 24 percent in California between July 1982 and July 1983, consumers who purchase "prudent buyer" insurance coverage will receive a premium reduction of at least 15 percent.

In Alameda County, a family of four recently paid \$245 a month for a plan covering all hospital and physician services. Under the PPO plan, the premium is set at \$211 and includes a broader range of benefits such as pap smears, well-baby care and reimbursement for annual check ups.

In Minnesota, a Blue Cross/Blue Shield sponsored PPO has signed up almost all of the hospitals in the Minneapolis-St. Paul area, and will save subscribers \$10 million this year in hospital costs.

The PPO's attribute their success to three factors:

First, they screen claims continually so that they can remove from preferred lists those providers who overcharge, engage in excessive diagnostic work, or practice "creative billing."

Second, they utilize only those doctors, hospitals and other providers who are cost-efficient.

Third, if a community establishes a preferred provider arrangement, non-participating doctors and hospitals must restrain their price increases, or risk losing to the PPO their share of the health care market.

Despite the proven appeal of these new financing arrangements, there are major obstacles that prevent their use nationwide. Some PPO's have felt the chilling effects of legal constraints such as State insurance laws which bar insurers from varying the amount of reimbursement among the providers of health care. Indiana has such a statute.

Some States have so-called freedom of choice laws which prohibit insurers from influencing a covered patient's choice of health care providers. Under these statutes, insurers can do absolutely nothing to discourage patients from seeing doctors who overcharge.

The purpose of the Preferred Provider Health Care Act of 1983, is to remove these legal obstacles. Specifically, this legislation would strike down State laws that limit a patient's choice of provider, restrict insurers from negotiating contracts for lower rates of payment, or that would prohibit the lawful negotiation of contracts among one or more health plan payors.

In short, the Preferred Provider Health Care Act, does nothing but strike the barriers to PPO development around the country.

The legislation would not cost anything and it would not lay out a prescriptive set of ground rules for their development.

Preferred provider organizations offer communities across the country what they are looking for—flexibility. The flexibility inherent in a PPO arrangement allows communities to develop financing arrangements tailored to meet the health care needs of the local community.

If health care consumers have more choices, there will be more competition for the consumer's dollar and providers will have to take steps to keep their prices in line with the competition—thus cutting costs for us all.

Mr. Speaker, the growing preoccupation with health care cost control in America is not misplaced. Americans

spent \$321 billion, or \$1 out of every \$10 on health care last year. Health care costs have become an economic pac-man, literally gobbling up everything in sight.

Faced with these rising costs, the American people are saying that reform is needed in the way this country delivers medical services. Workers will no longer sit quietly by while their pay increases melt in the face of rising costs for health insurance premiums. The business community now places employer costs for health benefit plans covering workers and dependents at the top of their list of concerns.

Almost everyone agrees that the Federal Government needs to play a role in restraining health care costs. Some go further and argue that the only way to restrain these costs is through massive Federal regulation that would bring stiff cost controls to every sector of American medicine. Advocates of this position claim that every other approach to controlling costs has been tried and found wanting.

The recent development of PPO's demonstrates that it may be possible to control health costs in this country without huge doses of new Federal regulation. If Congress will enact modest legislation, removing the existing barriers that limit access to alternative health care arrangements like preferred provider organizations, all Americans might soon have the opportunity to say no to higher medical costs.●

HONORING 300 YEARS OF GERMANS IN AMERICA

HON. DON RITTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1983

● Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 300th anniversary of Germans in America. I would like to share with my colleagues some of the many achievements this group of people has contributed, both individually and as a group, to the development of our Nation.

Pennsylvania's Lehigh Valley is an area rich in industry agriculture, and great natural beauty—in many ways similar to Germany's lovely valleys. It is easy to see, then, why so many German immigrants chose to settle in this area. I am proud to say that the Lehigh Valley has a large number of German-Americans. Many of the towns bear German names—towns like Hellertown, Guthsville, Fogelsville, New Berlinsville, Germanville, and Snydersville echo the names of their settlers or their settlers' place of origin. All over the United States,

more than 52 million Americans can trace their heritage to Germany.

The German settlers brought to their new homeland not only their industriousness and ingenuity, but also their religion and education. The large German families, often with more than 10 children, cleared the land and made it productive. They built the roads that connected the farms; they built the small, practical one-room schoolhouses; they built the lovely churches, with their heavenward-reaching steeples. Most important, these newcomers to America gave back to their adopted land more than they could ever take from it. Their appreciation of church, family, of the value of their own property and that of others, of hard work and its rewards, made them good neighbors and honest businessmen. Today, along the back roads of the Lehigh Valley, the hex signs on the old barns, the enduring farmhouses and the old mills are a symbol of their achievements in agriculture and industry. The legacy built by generations of these proud people will never diminish.

Part of this enduring legacy and contribution of our Nation is the role of German-American in our Nation's struggles. As the 13 colonies declared their independence from Great Britain, it was the German-American foot soldier who acquitted himself with valor in the ensuing struggle. While we rightfully remember the great work of men like Baron von Steuben, we tend to overlook the role of the individual foot soldier. From the fields and towns of the Lehigh Valley area came many young men to fight in the war for independence. At the battles of Trenton, Monmouth, Chadds Ford, Valley Forge, Harlem Heights, and countless others, they were the ones who drove the British to defeat. The Pennsylvania Militia, born of a frontier spirit, could outshoot and outfight most of the British units. Their long guns were deadly accurate for distance up to a quarter mile.

Those who chose not to fight, such as the Moravians of Bethlehem, did not shrink from duty; instead of taking up arms, they opened up their arms. The Moravian settlement on the banks of the Monocacy Creek became a hospital for wounded soldiers. Today, in the old Moravian buildings, bloodstains on the huge floor beams can still be seen.

After the war ended, they returned to their towns and farms and began to rebuild and expand the Nation they had just fought for.

Again during the Civil War, many men of German-American heritage followed the calls of Abraham Lincoln in his request for volunteers to defend and preserve the Union. The first defenders of Lehigh County were one of the first groups to arrive in defense of Washington, D.C. and took up tempo-

rary quarters in the Capitol. As before, these men acquitted themselves with bravery on the bloody battlefields of Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, Kentucky, and the Carolinas. One young German-American, Ignatz Gresser, a corporal in Company D in the 128th Pennsylvania Infantry, displayed valor above and beyond the call of duty in the Battle of Antietam; he remains the only person from Lehigh County to be awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor.

While this century has been witness to two unfortunate world wars, pitting our countries against one another, the friendship we share is something that has not lessened. Both nations play an instrumental role in protecting the world from Soviet aggression and maintaining freedom for all people. Together, our industry is like the heart and pulsebeat of the world; our technicians help to make the world a better place. Together, as one people, we must continue the work of our forefathers in promoting the ideals which will lead to a better way of life for all people. This is why I believe that it is all fitting and proper that Congress honor this important anniversary and recognize the many significant achievements of the Germans in America.

I am especially pleased to be acquainted with the members of the Lehigh-Saarbruecken Friendship Association, of Allentown, and its sister association in Germany, the Deutsch-Pennsylvanischer Freundeskreis e.V., of Saarbruecken. Members of the West German group visited the 15th district, and their presence was a good reminder of the common goals we share, and the friendship between the German and the American people.●

TO HONOR BETTIE ABRAMS

HON. JERRY LEWIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1983

● Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, October 26, the Arrowhead chapter of Hadassah will be honoring a very special lady, Bettie Abrams, at a tribute luncheon and supply shower. Unable to attend this gathering, I would like to take this opportunity to ask the Congress to join me along with her many friends and admirers in expressing our deep appreciation and gratitude to this outstanding human being for her many years of dedicated service.

The Women of Hadassah, over 370,000 strong, comprise the largest Zionist organization in the world, and are solely responsible for the Hadassah medical organization and Hadassah hospitals in Israel. The Arrowhead chapter of Hadassah generously pro-

vides needed equipment for Hadassah's hospitals.

Bettie Abrams' strong commitment to Hadassah and Israel has been manifested by her tireless efforts on behalf of the Arrowhead chapter of Hadassah. Although an active business leader in her community she has always in her calm, gracious, and sincere manner strived to see any projects she has been a part of succeed.

Bettie is a busy wife, mother, and grandmother who still finds time to contribute to her community and to Hadassah. She has done outstanding work as life membership chairman, as membership vice president, and as a dedicated member of the annual Bid'N Buy committee. In addition, she has served on the membership committee of Congregation Emanu El for 3 years, been active in its sisterhood, and is an ardent supporter of the Ida Mayer Cummings Auxiliary of the Jewish Home for the Aged, serving on their board of directors.

Bettie Abrams has worked with her husband, Richard, an associate member of the Arrowhead chapter of Hadassah, in their family business, Grand Jewelers, for over 20 years and they have also devoted countless hours to the temple and the United Jewish Appeal. Bettie and Richard are the proud parents of two married children and three beautiful grandchildren.

All who are privileged to work with Bettie Abrams recognize and admire her dedication as an outstanding citizen and for her charitable contributions which have made her community a better place to live. Mr. Speaker, I take great pride in commending to my colleagues, Bettie Abrams, for her tireless hours of devotion and many years of hard work to benefit the people of her community in a most refreshing way.●

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1983

● Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, due to an important meeting on business in my district on Friday, September 30, I was forced to miss three rollcall votes.

On rollcall No. 371, passage of House Resolution 239, the rule for H.R. 2912, Department of Justice Appropriation Authorization Act for fiscal year 1984, I would have voted "aye." On rollcall No. 373, the Wolpe amendment to H.R. 3231, the Export Administration Amendments of 1983, applying International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards to nuclear technology, I would have voted "aye." On rollcall No. 375, the Whitten motion that the House

October 19, 1983

recede from its disagreement and concur in Senate amendment No. 7 to House Joint Resolution 368, continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1984, with an amendment increasing obligatory authority for the Department of Defense, I would have voted "aye."●

RESPONSE TO KAL FLIGHT 007 DEATHS

HON. CARROLL HUBBARD, JR.

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1983

● Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, I have received a thought-provoking letter from a fellow Kentuckian, Mrs. Denise E. Sogorka, of Russell Springs, Ky. Denise Sogorka calls for vigorous and strong actions by Congress in response to the brutal attack by the Soviet Union upon Korean Airlines flight 007 which caused the deaths of 269 innocent men, women and children.

I believe my colleagues will be interested in her October 9 letter to me regarding the Soviet's attack and the United Nations, and the letter follows:

RUSSELL SPRINGS, KY., October 9, 1983.
HON. CARROLL HUBBARD,
Rayburn Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Let me inform you of my sentiments on the United Nations and Gromyko's entourage and the Korean airliner disaster.

The United States takes such abuse from these barbarians, continually giving them an elegant platform from which to address the world with their propaganda that I begin to lose respect for our leaders. Hurrah for Mr. Lichenstein and Jeane Kirkpatrick!

Don't let us down by placating the Soviets. Don't let them get away with murder figuratively and literally! Are honor and principle forgotten because it might hurt us little? I want to see us stop aid and trade with Russia.

I want to see us withdraw from the United Nations where we are nothing but burdened fools. I want to see the United Nations sent packing.

I want to see our representatives stand up for the U.S.A. and its people instead of cowering to third world socialist countries and our big enemies that we have helped develop.

I want to see you adamantly pursuing punitive measures against the Soviets for the attack on the commercial plane, even if it means some discomfort to us! Where is honor? Where is principle?

Sincerely,

DENISE E. SOGORKA.●

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

GENOCIDE IN UKRAINE 50 YEARS AGO

HON. JIM COURTER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1983

● Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, the 50th anniversary of a terroristic act against a subjugated nation in the Soviet Union is commemorated this year. I am referring to the artificial Ukrainian famine imposed by Stalin in 1932 and 1933. The Ukrainian territory suffered an acute loss of population through deaths due to the genocidal famine, the masses killed and deported during the repressions and the decrease in the number of births. Entire villages and farms were erased; livestock and horses were scarce; cannibalism became a common occurrence; 7 million lives were snuffed out. The Ukraine, once the most fertile of regions, became a deserted wasteland.

The Ukrainian region possesses key characteristics which posed formidable threats to Moscow's efforts at centralization: the cohesiveness of the populace, the economic importance of the region, the longevity of their distinct cultural heritage, and their susceptibility to Western influence. To this day, the Ukrainians abound with such an independent nationalistic consciousness and have fervently resisted attempts at Russification. The past decades of continued repression have served to intensify the Ukrainian resistance to the Russian way of life.

Was the death of at least 7 million Ukrainians an unfortunate, yet unavoidable, consequence of Stalin's determination to rapidly collectivize? This explanation must not be swallowed by the free people of the world. This act was history's first fabricated famine intended to quell the nationally spirited Ukrainian peasantry. It is critical that the Western World remain aware of this catastrophe and recognize it as an organized attempt at genocide.

The Soviets have illustrated to the world their disregard for human rights and human lives countless times. The recent downing of the Korean jetliner is only the most recent of a long chain of contemptible actions taken by Soviet regimes. It is the responsibility of the free independent Western world to mourn the victims of these crimes, to punish the perpetrators, and to strive to prohibit the reoccurrence of such flagrant violations of human rights.●

28517

VIETNAM VETERANS MEMORIAL FIRST ANNIVERSARY

HON. DUNCAN HUNTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1983

● Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, today, October 19, 1983, marks the first anniversary of the dedication of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial here in Washington. Veterans fought a difficult battle after the war, to get the respect and recognition they rightfully deserved. The construction and dedication of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial was a fitting way for America to welcome home those who so valiantly served.

I am troubled though, by the course of events since the dedication ceremonies. Despite the intent of all concerned: the veterans, the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund, the National Park Service, and this Congress, the memorial has become politicized. This was most apparent this July 2, when groups opposing and supporting the Reagan administration policies on Central America gathered on opposite sides of the memorial. As manifestations of popular opinion, both of these demonstrations should have occurred. But we must remember that the Vietnam Veterans Memorial was designed to honor those who served, and not to become a focal point for partisan demonstrations. As a Vietnam veteran, I feel that a demonstration at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial is as abhorrent as a demonstration at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier in Arlington Cemetery would be. The Vietnam Veterans Memorial is not an appropriate place.

For this reason, today I am introducing the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Dignity Act. Twenty-four of our colleagues have joined me as original cosponsors of this important legislation, which would expand the boundaries of the memorial as a way of preserving the intent and dignity of the area. I firmly believe that the intent of the Congress has been violated, and I feel that this measure will restore the quiet dignity of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial.●

PUBLIC SHOULD BE INFORMED ABOUT GENETIC ENGINEERING

HON. ALBERT GORE, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1983

● Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, the most recent issue of Biotechnology magazine contained an article that I believe all Members of the Congress should read. The article reported the results

of a recent poll that surveyed the attitudes of Americans toward genetic engineering.

The results of the survey are dramatic. Nearly two-thirds of the American people believe that we, as a society, should proceed with caution with genetic engineering, and one-third believe that genetic engineering may cause more harm than good. The survey also revealed that many Americans have mistaken views about the various potential applications of genetic engineering, especially to human beings.

As the new genetic technology develops and presents our society with new and powerful capabilities, it will become increasingly important that our citizenry have a good understanding of the technology's potential for both good and bad. An informed public is essential if we are to make reasoned decisions about the technology.

Earlier this year, I introduced legislation to create the President's Commission on the Human Applications of Genetic Engineering. A key function of that Commission would be to serve as a mechanism for informing the public about the possibilities for human genetic engineering and the tremendous moral and ethical issues raised by it. That legislation is now part of H.R. 2350, the Health Research Extension Act of 1983. I urge my colleagues to support the legislation when it is brought before the House for a vote.

The full text of the Biotechnology article is reprinted below. I encourage my colleagues to read it.

PUBLIC SAYS GENETIC ENGINEERS SHOULD PROCEED CAUTIOUSLY

(By Tabitha M. Powledge)

NEW YORK, N.Y.—Nearly two-thirds of the American people appear to believe society should exercise caution in proceeding with genetic engineering, and almost a third of them are worried that genetic engineering may result in more harm than benefit. These negative feelings about genetic engineering have been turning up in the past few years in public opinion surveys by the polling firm of Yankelovich, Skelly & White. Scientists and others professionally involved with genetic engineering techniques ought to be taking steps to counter them, advises Larry Kaagan, vice-president of the firm.

Pollsters for Yankelovich, which is located here, have been gathering data on public attitudes toward genetic engineering for the past few years as part of the company's annual Corporate Priorities Study. The study measures and tracks changes in attitudes of the public and opinion leaders on an array of policy issues that may affect business, and is underwritten by a group of corporations whose identity the polling firm will not reveal. At the behest of some of its clients with interests in biotechnology, Yankelovich began including questions about genetic engineering in its annual survey three years ago.

Somewhat to their surprise, the pollsters discovered that upwards of 70 percent of the

American public was aware of the term "genetic engineering." Kaagan hastens to point out that figure does not mean that people know what genetic engineering is or how it is applied, but only that they have heard of it.

Although 31 percent of the Yankelovich respondents said they think the problems genetic engineering creates may outweigh its benefits, 39 percent viewed the technology positively, saying they think benefits are more likely than problems. The other 30 percent had no opinion, which reflects the novelty of genetic engineering techniques and society's lack of experience with them, Kaagan says. He regards these figures simply as a benchmark that will become more meaningful after his company has kept track of them for a few years.

The Yankelovich results are in line with results from other surveys, notably those conducted every two years for the National Science Board (NSB). These surveys disclosed substantial opposition to the creation of new life forms, although this opposition dropped slightly between 1979 and 1981. NSB will report these data in its next Science Indicators Study, due early next year. In 1981, the first time the question was asked, about a third of the survey respondents said they think the risks of recombinant DNA or genetic engineering research would outweigh the benefits.

Yankelovich's Kaagan observes that many people who say they are worried about genetic engineering's potential results are probably responding intuitively, influenced by cultural stereotypes like the Frankenstein story, rather than expressing rational concerns about tampering with the gene pool. Jon D. Miller, director of the Public Opinion Laboratory at Northern Illinois University in DeKalb, which conducts the NSB polls, makes a similar observation. "The Frankenstein notion is very strong in our culture," he notes.

Sixty-two percent of the people Yankelovich surveyed said society should proceed with caution on genetic engineering. "Much of that caution came from people who are nominally supporters of the technology," Kaagan points out. "There is a sense that until we know more there is a temptation to go faster than we should, that we are more likely to create the problems first and find the answers later. There's a declining willingness to see that pattern repeated." Kaagan says he views this caution as part of a new public attitude toward technology in general. People continue to have faith that technology will play a major role in solving social and economic problems, he says, but they also retain much of the skepticism about technology's consequences that was common in the late 1960s and early 1970s.

The NSB study focused on two special groups of people, those who were particularly attentive to and knowledgeable about science, and those who were interested but did not view themselves as especially informed. Each group accounts for about 20 percent of the American people, according to Miller. Like the Yankelovich pollsters, his group found that even people who are well disposed toward science are worried about genetic engineering, although there is some evidence the worry may be decreasing.

In 1979, 56 percent of the "attentives" thought that scientists should not be allowed to conduct studies concerning the creation of new life forms. By the fall of 1981, that figure dropped to 51 percent, a statistically significant difference. Sixty-nine percent of the "interested" opposed creation

of new life forms in 1979, a figure that dropped to 67 percent, a non-significant change, two years later.

As of 1981, 58 percent of the "attentives" thought the benefits of genetic engineering would outweigh the risks, 4 percent thought risks and benefits are about equal, and 32 percent thought the risks would be greater. The "interested" were significantly more pessimistic; only 47 percent believed benefits would be greater than risks, 7 percent saw them as equal, and 35 percent perceived the risks as greater.

Miller thinks these attitudes are largely a function of education and exposure to science. People with only a high school education tend to be most worried about the possible consequences of genetic engineering. By contrast, leaders and opinion makers in the scientific community are almost completely positive—87 percent think the benefits will outweigh the risks, and only 8 percent see the risks as more important.

The largest number of Yankelovich's survey respondents (61 percent) expect genetic engineering to be used for health care applications, but the second most frequently mentioned potential application was to test tube babies (58 percent). "That number is an artifact of press coverage more than anything else," Kaagan claims. "It has to do with cutting edge medical technology, which, to an uninformed or underinformed public, is very easily lumped into aggregates that may have nothing to do with one another." This is just further evidence, Kaagan says, that the "public is acquiring its impressions (of genetic engineering) from a disparate variety of sources, very few of which have anything to do with the scientific/business community that is advancing the technology."

To those who point out that genetic engineering is *not* being applied to test tube babies, and that test tube babies have nothing to do with biotechnology, Kaagan replies that their points may be scientifically valid, but the public perceives things differently. People think "the temptation to pursue that next area is part of the bloodstream of the scientific community. Asserting that we're not ready to do this yet is not the same as saying that it will not be done. It smacks a little bit of the position of the nuclear industry when it said we're not going to have to worry about low level wastes for another 50 years. Well, the 50 years are now here," he asserts. "Those kinds of arguments may be comforting within the scientific community, but they will not hold a great deal of water for very long in a public debate."

Kaagan warns that the biotechnology industry should pay greater heed to the resolution calling for a ban on genetic engineering of human germ cells issued last June, which was endorsed by a number of academics and religious leaders and coordinated by Jeremy Rifkin of the Foundation of Economic Trends (Washington, DC). "It's probably beside the point that he may not represent a widespread movement, that he may not be voicing a genuine concern of a significant portion of the population," Kaagan argues. The scientific and business community, which has a stake in biotechnology, is "dismissing as irrelevant and inappropriate some of the qualms that Rifkin and his signatories have raised. But that is not stopping Rifkin and his signatories from beginning to do what the scientific community has not done, which is begin to involve the public—and key leadership groups in some cases as well—in a debate that will shape

the regulatory posture" of society, and, in the process, influence biotechnology's future.

Although biotechnologists need to take those concerns seriously, he warns against making Rifkin the target of their responses. "It's a perceptual and tactical mistake to identify the leader as the problem. It's the concerns that are the problem," Kaagan argues. People in the industry can deal with the concerns most effectively by following the debate and joining in, taking their case to the public with talk show appearances and articles in popular publications. Miller agrees, asserting that biotechnology can communicate most effectively by concentrating on the "attentives" and getting its message across on a relatively narrow band of media, such as the television program *Nova*. Biotechnologists should also be more willing to participate in the political process, not by ringing doorbells but by such methods as giving expert testimony and writing thoughtful letters to legislators, Miller says.

Kaagan cautions against exhibiting paternalism, however. Scientific explanations, he says, often "tend to be dismissive of public concerns: 'This is more complicated than you folks can possibly understand; I'm a scientist, leave it to me.' That will not wash."

The Yankelovich pollster emphasizes that the data so far are scanty, and that he is sounding a cautionary note rather than a rallying cry. Still, "it would be an important tactical and strategic mistake to dismiss the first rumblings of opposition," he asserts. "Don't retreat into the laboratory or to the boardroom on this one, because if you do, you're going to be blindsided. You're going to find that you're going to be fighting back against restrictive regulation."●

TRIBUTE TO RABBI TOBIAS ROTHENBERG

HON. ROBERT J. MRAZEK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1983

● Mr. MRAZEK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to bring to your attention a very special event which will soon take place on Long Island.

On October 24, Rabbi Tobias Rothenberg, spiritual leader of the Huntington Jewish Center and a leading community activist on Long Island, will be installed as president of the Long Island Board of Rabbis. With his election to this coveted post, Rabbi Rothenberg becomes the first person from Suffolk County ever chosen to lead this important and influential body.

It should come as no surprise to those familiar with Rabbi Rothenberg's remarkable work that he has been asked to head the Long Island Board of Rabbis. Indeed, for the past 40 years, he has devoted his singular efforts toward the advancement of an array of vitally important religious and community causes. As spiritual leader of congregations in Roanoke, Va., and Philadelphia, Pa., he actively dedicated his time and energy to such

widely varied activities as Jewish Family Services, Boy Scouts, Interfaith Affairs, and the Lions Club.

Rabbi Rothenberg has continued to maintain an extraordinary commitment to many causes since he arrived on Long Island to assume his responsibilities at the Huntington Jewish Center. He has served as president of the Clergy Association of Huntington and president of the Suffolk Board of Rabbis. As Jewish chaplain at Huntington Hospital and associate Jewish chaplain at the Northport VA Hospital, he has offered comfort and advice to countless persons in need of spiritual guidance. And as a board member of Suffolk County YMHA and a member of the Suffolk Advisory Committee of Jewish Community Services, he has continued to pursue the valuable community and social work he began years ago.

Mr. Speaker, as president of the Long Island Board of Rabbis, Rabbi Tobias Rothenberg will take his place as a leading voice for the rabbinical community, as well as for Long Island's sizable Jewish population. I can think of no individual better qualified to assume the duties and responsibilities of this important post. I salute Rabbi Rothenberg and the Long Island Board of Rabbis on this historic and memorable occasion.●

DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING DAY

HON. CARDISS COLLINS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1983

● Mrs. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the prolific efforts made by both Houses of Congress in passing one of the most significant pieces of legislation in our time—the creation of a national holiday in memory of Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

As I look back at the path which this legislation has taken, I see the culmination of a great struggle for freedom, a burning desire for opportunity, and a continual commitment for equality. Mirrored in this bill, I see a policeman snatching an American flag from a black child's hand; Rosa Parks defending her individual rights by sitting in the front seat of a public bus; the profile of Dr. King before the Lincoln Memorial in August 1963.

The quest has not been an easy one. We have met with adversity and have risen above the quagmire of racism. In turn, we must continue to pledge our allegiance to these principles we fought so hard to attain. We, in Congress, must continue to create and pass legislation which will help to rid us of poverty, unemployment, and give us peace for all perpetuity.

In summation, the Martin Luther King, Jr., bill is both an end and a be-

ginning. Not only is it an end to any doubt where Dr. King belongs in history, but more importantly, it is a goal we must all strive for.●

THE AFRO ARTS CULTURAL CENTRE IN HARLEM: A HERITAGE OF EXTENDING GOOD WILL

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1983

● Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the accomplishments of the Afro Arts Cultural Centre in Harlem. It is a community organization, founded in 1947, dedicated to the preservation and dissemination of the African cultural experience to the people of New York and the Nation as a whole.

For more than 35 years, the Afro Arts Cultural Centre has worked with Government officials and the United Nations with the objective of broadening the scope of American culture.

This small organization, the first cultural center in the city of New York, is unique in its ability to establish good will with the United Nations; emulating their agenda for peace; and extending these goals to their community. Its uniqueness is evident in its special programs, including a traditional honoring of community senior citizens, combining the day's activities with neighborhood youth in a salute to grandparents throughout the world.

The Afro Arts Cultural Centre has brought scores of outstanding performing artists, educators and historians together to acknowledge historic landmarks in the former Dutch colony, founded in 1658, called Nieuw Haarlem.

This organization's expertise and experience in the concept of exchanging brotherhood, through the arts and culture of one of the world's original people is to be commended. I am proud that this fine organization is there to serve my district, my city, and my Nation.●

H.R. 3231

HON. BOB EDGAR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1983

● Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, today the House resumes consideration of H.R. 3231, the Export Administration Act. When we consider title III of this legislation, my good friend and Philadelphia colleague, Representative BILL GRAY, will offer an amendment to prohibit all new U.S. investment in South Africa by both individuals and corpo-

rations. I urge Members to support this important amendment.

H.R. 3231 prohibits loans from our banks to the South African Government. The Gray amendment will expand upon this statement of opposition to apartheid by cutting off all new investment in South Africa. As in the bill, the amendment allows that sanctions can be suspended if the President determines that South Africa has made substantial progress toward full participation by all its people in the country's social, political, and economic life. The amendment would also set up civil and criminal penalties for individuals and businesses violating the investment prohibition.

Mr. Speaker, the unacceptable racist policies of the Government of South Africa are well known to Members of this body. The question we must answer regards the best approach for us to take in our relations with the current regime in Pretoria. The Gray amendment allows us to state our opposition to apartheid in no uncertain terms; there is no reason for us to invest in South Africa. While some respond that we can have more influence if we continue new investments, there is no evidence that this policy has been effective in the past. The Reagan administration's policy of "constructive engagement" in southern Africa has failed to produce notable results, yet we continue to invest heavily in a government based on principles we find morally unacceptable. South African growth and oppression continues on a base of American capital, but we fail to see improvements in South African policies. The answer is to stop supporting a reprehensible government.

I hope that my colleagues will join me in supporting the Gray amendment. I commend to their attention a column by William Raspberry which appeared in Monday's Washington Post and an article by Howard Wolpe, chairman of the House Subcommittee on Africa, which was published by the Los Angeles Times last Thursday. As we consider the Gray amendment, all of us should take note of the final line of the Raspberry piece, Bishop Desmond Tutu's comment about what disinvestment would mean for nonwhite South Africans: "We are suffering now, but then we would be suffering with hope." The articles follow:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 17, 1983]

NO NEW MONEY FOR SOUTH AFRICA

(By William Raspberry)

It's pretty much the American consensus: South Africa is the most brutally racist country in the world, an outcast among nations. Americans argue endlessly over how best to exert pressure to get South Africa to change its ways.

And yet the evidence is that a good deal of the evil that South Africa does is financed by American investments. It is this dilemma that is behind Rep. William H. Gray's pro-

posed amendment to the Export Administration Act now being debated in Congress.

The Philadelphia Democrat ticks off the numbers. In 1950, U.S. direct investment in South Africa amounted to \$140 million. By 1961, it had more than doubled to \$353 million. Last year, it was \$2.5 billion.

As to the importance of investment, Gray quotes Owen Horwood, the South African minister of finance: "The story of the economic development of this country is intimately bound up with foreign capital, technology and expertise. Significant investments usually bring all three. It allows us to do what we want to do rather more quickly. It allows us to do some things better than we would otherwise do."

Gray, whose notion is that South Africa already does some things dismayingly well, proposes to reduce its efficiency by curbing U.S. investments there. His amendment does not call for disinvestment; any U.S.-based company already doing business in South Africa would be allowed to continue. Nor would it prohibit the stock-exchange transactions involving South African companies.

What it would prevent is new American investment in South Africa, including direct investments as well as loans and credits to businesses there. (Money earned in South Africa could be reinvested in South Africa without penalty.)

Gray says he tried to draft the most effective measure with a reasonable chance of passage. A number of proposals for total disinvestment have failed of passage, and some of the measures that have passed have been only marginally effective, if at all.

This one, which he said last week appeared to be within 20 votes of passage, is calculated to avoid hurting Americans who already have invested in firms doing business in South Africa, but also to deny South Africa the additional funds it covets. The amendment authorizes the president to propose the lifting of the investment ban if, in his view, South Africa has made "substantial progress toward the full participation of all the people . . . in the social, political and economic life" of the country.

As is the case with other official sanctions, whether involving grain sales to Russia or cigar imports from Cuba, the Gray proposal is less likely to change behavior than to punish it, a fact Gray readily acknowledges.

"The administration's all-carrot-no-stick policy obviously hasn't worked," he said. "Maybe we can't change South Africa's behavior. But we can certainly stop supporting it."

Spokesmen for the South African government, contending that the nonwhite majority would suffer less with a flourishing economy than with a crippled one, often claim the best way to increase opportunity for blacks is to increase outside investment. Gray said that when that proposition was put to Bishop Desmond Tutu, the black South African leader first explained that it is considered seditious to advocate disinvestment, then:

"We are suffering now, but then we would be suffering with hope."

[From the Los Angeles Times, Oct. 13, 1983]

A NEW U.S. APPROACH TO SOUTH AFRICA

(By Howard Wolpe)

There are now five major bills pending before the U.S. Congress concerning South Africa, and many more resolutions. Once again, following a lull during the first two years of the Reagan Administration, South

Africa is the focus of congressional scrutiny. Why should this be so?

South Africa has been much on our minds ever since the National Party took power in 1948. It has spent those years entrenching and perfecting its system of institutionalized racism in open defiance of attempts by most other U.N. member states to have it end apartheid and extend political and social equality to all its citizens. Yet South Africa continues its horrendous policies that deny even a modicum of basic human rights to the vast majority of its people.

This Administration has insisted that South Africa is trying to reform. The State Department's Bureau of African Affairs in early 1981 initiated a series of steps, termed "constructive management," based on the premise that quiet diplomacy and closer U.S. association with the South African regime could encourage internal change and lead South Africa to end its illegal occupation of Namibia.

Second, South Africa continues to block a settlement of the Namibia conflict, successfully using the American insistence on linking Namibia's independence to the removal of Cuban troops from Angola as a way of prolonging a political settlement in that embattled territory.

Third, South Africa has dangerously escalated its destabilizing military and economic aggression against its black-ruled neighbors. South Africa occupies Angolan soil, and gives support to dissident groups in Angola and Mozambique. It has launched murderous raids into Lesotho and Mozambique. It has sought to overthrow the Seychelles government. And it has not hesitated to use economic sabotage against Zimbabwe and Mozambique as an added stick.

In short, "constructive engagement" has been an utter failure. It is clear that the options embraced by the Reagan Administration in hopes of alleviating a worsening situation in South Africa have in fact merely made matters worse. Not only is there more upheaval and violence in the southern African region today, but now—for the first time and as a direct consequence of "constructive engagement"—the United States has become directly implicated in these developments. We must understand the enormous damage that "constructive engagement" has done to American interests. For in African eyes the United States is now viewed as colluding with the South African government in delaying Namibia's independence, in fostering regional instability and in preserving the abhorrent system of apartheid.

It is against this backdrop that I and a number of my colleagues are pressing for the passage of legislation to recast the United States' foreign policy toward South Africa. We need to act now, before it is too late—too late to avoid an Armageddon in South Africa, and too late to disassociate the United States from apartheid and from South Africa's regional aggression.

Among the measures pending that call for various types of sanctions against the South African government, three are scheduled for a House vote on Tuesday: A bill by Rep. Howard L. Berman (D-Calif.) would reinstitute restrictions on exports to South Africa's police and military. Rep. Stephen J. Solarz's (D-N.Y.) bill would impose new restrictions on commercial activity and mandate fair employment practices for all U.S. companies doing business in South Africa, and a bill by William H. Gray III (D-Pa.)

would prohibit new U.S. corporate investment in South Africa until the President determines that there is demonstrable progress toward the elimination of apartheid.

Already passed and awaiting final approval is a bill by Rep. Julian C. Dixon (D-Calif.) that would disallow U.S. votes in the International Monetary Fund on behalf of nations that practice apartheid. Also pending is a bill by Rep. Charles B. Rangel (D-N.Y.) that would prohibit nuclear relations with South Africa.

These are the signals that we should be sending to South Africa's government so that it has no doubt concerning where the United States stands on apartheid, on the question of Namibia's independence and on South Africa's regional aggression. That country should know that its continued intransigence on these matters will precipitate changes in its relationship with the United States, and that those changes will prove costly.

U.S. interests on that continent require a redirection of American foreign policy toward South Africa. We cannot continue to struggle to achieve a just society at home and equivocate on our international obligations abroad. The racism and the denial of political rights that we will not tolerate at home must not be condoned by our posture overseas. Our national values, and our national interests, dictate that we act on South Africa before it is too late.●

HONORING THE OTI INTERNATIONAL SONG FESTIVAL

HON. ESTEBAN EDWARD TORRES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1983

● Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, this year people throughout the world will celebrate the 12th anniversary of the International Song Festival sponsored by the Organizacion de la Television Iberoamericana. The OTI International Song Festival is the largest international song festival in the world. This year for the first time, the United States is honored to be the host country for the international celebration. A reception honoring the board of directors of the Organizacion de la Television Iberoamericana and the performing artists of this year's International Song Festival will be held on October 28, at the Organization of American States in Washington, D.C. The live television performance of the 12th annual festival will be held October 29, at Constitution Hall in Washington, D.C. The SIN Television Network, the Nation's first and only Spanish language television network, serving 86 percent of the U.S. Hispanic population, will broadcast the October 29 event to 23 participating countries around the world.

The OTI International Song Festival was created by the Organizacion de la Television Iberoamericana, an organization of television stations in Latin America, Spain, and Portugal. The song festival was established over a

decade ago to encourage the creation of original musical material. It rewards both the singer and composer of each winning entry. The first festival was held in 1972 in Madrid, Spain. Former host countries of the international competition have included Argentina, Mexico, Brazil, Chile, Peru, Puerto Rico, and Venezuela.

The OTI Festival offers top artists and composers of Spanish and Portuguese speaking countries the opportunity to display their musical talents to a potential television audience of 196 million people. Participants of this year's international event will be winners of the national festivals which were held in Spain, Portugal, Latin America, the Caribbean countries, and the United States. A group of judges composed of leading figures from the Latin entertainment industry will select the winner during the international event. Among the special guests expected to attend this year's celebration are world-renowned opera singer, Placido Domingo, and the internationally acclaimed performer Julio Iglesias.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my fellow colleagues of the House of Representatives to extend best wishes for a successful event this year to the International Song Festival's member countries, its performing artists and the board of directors of the Organizacion de la Television Iberoamericana.●

THE CONTINUING SAGA OF BROKEN PROMISES AND HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS BY THE SANDINISTA GOVERNMENT

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1983

● Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this body will again consider the issue of U.S. policy with regard to Nicaragua tomorrow when we debate the fiscal year 1984 intelligence authorization bill. And once again opponents of our Nation's current policy of providing covert assistance to surrounding nations in that region to prevent the export of terrorism and military support from Nicaragua to bordering countries, will charge that the United States seeks through these efforts to overthrow the ruling Sandinista government.

As I have done so often since returning from Nicaragua last spring, I want to assure my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that it is not the United States, as some would have us believe, that is attempting to oust the Sandinista government, but instead the very people of Nicaragua who are tired after 4 years of waiting for unfulfilled promises to be honored. An editorial

in this morning's Washington Times describes this coalition of Nicaraguans leading the revolution as:

A disenchanted faction of the original Sandinista movement, a group of oppressed and angry Miskito Indians and creoles, and a coalition of erstwhile allies of the Sandinistas and former Somoza supporters . . . They have one goal: To force the Sandinistas to fulfill the promise of the revolution against Somoza. In short, they want the elections the Sandinistas pledged in 1979.

Throughout the year, I have cited first-hand accounts of people who have traveled to Nicaragua to record the growing unrest in the small towns, the fields and the jungles of Nicaragua. It is there that the Nicaraguans have tired of waiting for the free elections, free press, freedom of religion, and economic and human rights reforms the Sandinistas promised during the overthrow of the Somoza regime.

All freedom loving people of Nicaragua have suffered through the injustices of the Sandinistas, but none more than the Miskito Indians. Perhaps this tribe best symbolizes all that has been endured by the people of Nicaragua.

In a column also appearing in today's Washington Times, Lee Anne Carmichael, vice president of Universal Impact Foundation, a nonpartisan organization supplying medical aid to the Miskito Indians, related the special injustices the Miskito Indians have suffered at the hands of the Sandinistas. Ms. Carmichael writes:

The Sandinistas initially promised the autonomous nation of Mosquitia that its traditional lifestyle would be legally protected and its lands would not be expropriated. But, like all the spurious agreements made by the Marxists in Nicaragua, the Indians were brutally uprooted and forced into detention camps . . .

Ms. Carmichael writes of the Miskitos' life since the Sandinista takeover. This peace-loving tribe of Indians is now confined to forced labor camps to work in the sugar-cane fields. They are malnourished and live in overcrowded, unsanitary, germ-ridden areas and are denied proper medical care. They are also denied many of their most sacred cultural practices, such as speaking in their native dialect.

The Sandinistas' treatment of the Miskito Indians has aroused this otherwise tranquil group to rise up and fight to overthrow this oppressive government. Together with the thousands of other Nicaraguans who have been deprived of their rights, they seek to replace the Sandinistas with a government which will honor its commitments and restore peace and human rights as the benchmark for its government.

The people of Nicaragua look to our Nation for support. As Ms. Carmichael says:

Our democracy and freedom are based on the support we can provide those whose freedom is in jeopardy or already lost.

Following my remarks I have included the editorial and column from the Washington Times for the information of my colleagues. When the question of U.S. policy towards Nicaragua is considered again tomorrow, I hope the Members of this body will keep the plight of the freedom-loving people of Nicaragua in mind so that our Nation does not again turn its back on them at this time when our support is urgently needed.

[From the Washington Times, Oct. 19, 1983]

THE BETRAYAL OF A REVOLUTION

A critical moment for Central America comes tomorrow when the CIA authorization bill comes to the House floor. The measure includes money for the "contras" fighting the Marxist junta in Nicaragua, and there has been an appalling lack of nerve in that body to confront the challenge and reality in that turbulent region.

Who are these Nicaraguan "contras" by whom so many congressmen are afraid to be tainted? A disenchanted faction of the original Sandinista movement, a group of oppressed and angry Miskito Indians and creoles, and a coalition of erstwhile allies of the Sandinistas and former Somoza supporters. All have some degree of support from the U.S. Though separated by miles of jungle and mutual suspicions, they have one goal: To force the Sandinistas to fulfill the promise of the revolution against Somoza. In short, they want the elections the Sandinistas pledged in 1979.

These are the people we're worried about supporting? Against a regime which has forfeited legitimacy by becoming an even greater violator of human rights than its predecessor? And forfeited its right to hide behind the principle of non-intervention by meddling directly and violently in the affairs of its Central American neighbors, on behalf of a revolution without frontiers?

The House leadership had postponed until now voting on the funding for "covert activities" hoping that the impact of the Soviet shootdown of the Korean airliner will be less of a factor. This is unfortunate because the brutal killing of 269 civilians holds a lesson powerfully relevant to dealing with the junta in Managua. In both cases, the U.S. is dealing with confirmed Marxist-Lennists for whom force is the only imperative. We were indelibly reminded of the similarity in outlook by the Nicaraguan junta's first reaction to the Flight 007 killings—the Sandinista leadership parroted the Soviet line, accusing the U.S. of having been shamelessly spying.

There are those who believe that the negotiations being charted by the Contadora group are a promising way to bring Nicaragua round to less aggressive policies. Think again. The junta's leaders can't be sweet-talked out of their objectives. Only unremitting pressure, the denial of sanctuary from which to train and arm revolutionaries, and the threat that they might lose everything, is likely to produce results.

Perhaps if we had not been so squeamish at the Bay of Pigs, things would be different today. The U.S. wouldn't have to worry about the inevitable social revolutions in Central America and the Caribbean going astray, destabilizing the entire area, or becoming bases for projection of Soviet power.

The general uprising against the Somoza regime in Nicaragua would not have been captured by totalitarians—because this wouldn't have been possible without Cuban backing.

We now have a chance to profit from that mistake.

[From the Washington Times, Oct. 19, 1983]

THE MISKITOS: WHY NO OUTRAGE?

(By Lee Anne Carmichael)

There is an overwhelming sense of confusion and apathy over the role of the United States in Central America. Recent polls indicate that a mere 8 percent of the population knows which side our government supports in El Salvador and Nicaragua. Bearing this doleful statistic in mind, the lack of outrage over the genocide of the Miskito Indians in Nicaragua should come as no surprise.

Public protest over perceived human rights violations historically has always come too late. Is it too late for indigenous people of Nicaragua, or does the international community have the opportunity to save the Miskitos from extinction? And, what exactly has been happening to the Indians, and why has there been so little information about their situation?

The answer to the latter part of this query is twofold. Department of Zelaya, the province in which a majority of the Nicaraguan Indians have traditionally resided, has been decreed off limits to all foreigners since 1980, when the initial efforts of the Sandinista government to integrate the Indians into the revolutionary process of Marxism was met with resistance. The Sandinistas did not want to soil their reputation as saviors of the poor, and have their dirty laundry washed in the basins of the international media. Furthermore, anti-anti-communist bias promulgated by the liberal intelligentsia in this country precludes truthful discourse on any Marxist regime. But, the tragic destruction of an autonomous nation of 200,000 people cannot be hidden forever.

In December 1981, the Sandinista government embarked on a program of massive resettlement of the Indian population in order to create a militarily secure zone along the east coast and the border of Honduras. The unarmed Indians were attacked in their homes and thousands imprisoned. Eye witness reports from exiled Miskitos in Honduras disclose murders, torture, and people being buried alive during the relocation. Virtually every Indian community was destroyed.

The "Jicaques" Indians, which include the Miskito, Sumu and Rama tribes, have enjoyed the rights of self-government, use of their own language (including English), religious freedom, and rights to ownership of their communal lands through treaties and legislative decrees enacted by various governments since 1860. They traditionally have lived in a communal manner, dividing their labor between agriculture, hunting, fishing and lumbering. Culturally, the indigenous people were organized into several communes and presided over by democratically elected leaders, the Council of Elders. The Sandinistas initially promised the autonomous nation of Mosquitia that its traditional lifestyle would be legally protected and its lands would not be expropriated. But, like all the spurious agreements made by the Marxists in Nicaragua, the Indians were brutally uprooted and forced into detention camps, one definitively documented and known as Camp Cukra Hill. Twelve

thousand indigenes, none over the age of 35, are housed at Cukra Hill, where the able-bodied are forced to labor involuntarily in the sugar-cane fields under the constant threat of armed Cuban militia.

Malnutrition, rampant disease and terror are now an ever-present reality for these once healthy, independent human beings. The Nicaraguan doctor at the camp has virtually no medical supplies to tend to the endemic goiter, skin diseases, broken bones and any number of other illnesses contracted in an area with no sanitary facilities, overcrowding and an overwhelming sense of hopelessness.

These people are prohibited from speaking their native dialect—and prohibited from leaving. Sources close to Indian exiles in Honduras state that the Sandinista plan to move the Miskitos again, this time well into the interior of Nicaragua. Another forced march on these sorely depleted people will surely lead to more deaths and further physical impairment. Rebellion will mean massacre.

Human rights violations by the democratically elected Salvadoran government fill the pages of the major newspapers in the United States, as did the abuses by the former Somoza regime in Nicaragua. Dr. Jose Esteban Gonzalez, former National Coordinator of the Permanent Commission of Nicaraguan Human Rights stated in an interview in Washington in 1982 that he could "call the editors of the major U.S. newspapers, and any statements concerning violations of human rights by the Somoza regime made headlines the following day. Today, they don't even answer my calls." He since has been forced into exile by the communists.

These Soviet-supported revolutionaries have every intention of eliminating every last non-supporter of their regime. A nation of peace-loving, independent people who refuse to buckle under to the Sandinista doctrine of international Marxism, soon may be yet another extinct species on the face of the earth.

Our democracy and freedom are based on the support we can provide those whose freedom is in jeopardy or already lost. Civic action and government policy are the only routes available to save the indigenous people of Nicaragua. It's still not too late.●

JOAN HARRISON, PRESIDENT
U.S. JAYCEE WOMEN

HON. WILLIAM R. RATCHFORD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 19, 1983

● Mr. RATCHFORD. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to honor the American tradition of voluntarism and one of my district's most noted volunteers, Joan Harrison.

Voluntarism is indeed a great American tradition. Americans have always been willing to give of their time and in many cases their lives for the sake of a worthy cause. It is this type of sacrifice which has made America the great Nation that it is today. Joan, who is the president of the U.S. Jaycee women, exemplifies this type of voluntarism.

Joan became a charter member of the Danbury Jaycee Women in Connecticut in 1976 and has since served as treasurer, state director, and president. Over the years, she has received several awards in recognition of her significant contributions to her community. These awards include being named Outstanding Jaycee Woman of the Month and Quarter, U.S. Jaycee Congresswoman, and State President of the Month. She has received the Presidential Spirit Award four times and was named one of five outstanding State leaders in the Nation.

I am sure everyone remembers the frustration we all felt during the Iranian hostage crisis. During this period, people all over the country were doing their part to symbolize their concern for the hostages. The State of Connecticut was fortunate to have Joan at this time. She was instrumental in implementing and promoting the "Tie-a-Yellow-Ribbon" campaign in Connecticut. I worked with Joan on this project and was particularly impressed with her dedication to the community, as well as to the sincerity of her concern for the hostages.

An inspiration to Connecticut's young women, Joan is committed to offering young women the opportunity to achieve personal development and leadership training; while teaching them how they can channel their energies toward bettering their communities.

Joan's role in promoting the Jaycee women as a leadership training organization for young women is unmeasurable. By stressing the positive image of the Jaycee women, Joan has placed this vital organization on the map. Her accomplishments are not limited to the Jaycee women. She is also active with the Parent/Teacher Association, and is on the advisory board of Lanbury Hospital.

A domestic engineer/professional volunteer is how Joan describes herself after years of service to others. This type of dedication should never go unnoticed. For it is this type of voluntarism which gives America strength and sets us above other nations. I commend Joan for her efforts and her accomplishments. Ours is truly a better community because of this great woman.●

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when sched-

uled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Any changes in committee scheduling will be indicated by placement of an asterisk to the left of the name of the unit conducting such meetings.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, October 20, 1983, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

OCTOBER 21

9:00 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources
Public Lands and Reserved Water Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 1504, to provide for protection of historic shipwrecks, structures, and artifacts located on a seabed or in the subsoil of the lands beneath U.S. waters, and S. 1647, to authorize the use of funds from rental of floating drydock and other marine equipment to support the national maritime museum in San Francisco, Calif.

SD-366

9:30 a.m.

Finance
International Trade Subcommittee

To hold hearings on miscellaneous trade and tariff bills.

SD-215

10:00 a.m.

Judiciary

To hold hearings on S. 1581, to grant congressional approval to the central interstate low-level radioactive waste compact.

SD-226

Joint Economic

To hold hearings to review the impact of deficits on interest rates.

SD-138

11:00 a.m.

Judiciary
Courts Subcommittee

Business meeting, to mark up S. 1706, to provide for the positive identification of persons holding identification documents.

SD-226

OCTOBER 24

10:00 a.m.

Finance

To hold hearings to discuss the committee report and its recommendations on reform and simplification of corporate income taxation.

SD-215

Judiciary

To hold hearings on S. 1870, proposed Credit and Debit Card Counterfeiting and Fraud Act.

SD-226

2:00 p.m.

Armed Services

To resume hearings on the impact of proposed regulatory authority of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy on national defense and related Gov-

ernment activities focusing on spare parts procurement of the Department of Defense.

SD-124

OCTOBER 25

9:30 a.m.

Governmental Affairs

Oversight of Government Management Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings to review computer security policy in the Federal Government and the private sector.

SD-342

Judiciary

Patents, Copyrights and Trademarks Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 31 and S. 175, bills to provide an exemption from copyright liability for certain types of video recording for noncommercial purposes.

SD-226

Labor and Human Resources

To resume oversight hearings on alleged illegal sales of union memberships or books to unqualified welders by officials of local chapters of the International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Shipbuilders, Blacksmiths, Forgers, and Helpers.

SD-430

10:00 a.m.

Armed Services

To continue hearings on the impact of proposed regulatory authority of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy on national defense and related government activities, focusing on spare parts procurement of the Department of Defense.

SR-253

Energy and Natural Resources

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

SD-366

Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings on S. 1746, proposed Freedom From Government Competition Act.

SD-342

Judiciary

To hold hearings on S. 462, to clarify certain provisions of the Hobbs Act relating to Federal jurisdiction over labor extortion matters.

SR-485

Labor and Human Resources

Education, Arts, and Humanities Subcommittee

To resume oversight hearings on vocational educational programs administered by the Department of Education.

SD-628

Joint Economic

Economic Goals and Intergovernmental Policy Subcommittee

To hold hearings on voluntary Japanese auto export restraints.

SR-385

2:00 p.m.

Armed Services

To continue hearings on the impact of proposed regulatory authority of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy on national defense and related government activities, focusing on spare parts procurement of the Department of Defense.

SR-253

OCTOBER 26

9:00 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

SD-430

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings on the nomination of Diane K. Steed, of the District of Columbia, to be Administrator of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.

SR-253

Environment and Public Works
Business meeting, to resume markup of S. 1330, to develop long-term job opportunities in public works, and S. 1739, to authorize the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States.

SD-406

Governmental Affairs
Oversight of Government Management Subcommittee
To continue oversight hearings to review computer security policy in the Federal Government and the private sector.

SD-628

Labor and Human Resources
To hold hearings to review volunteer initiatives in health.

SD-430

Special on Aging
To hold hearings to examine State, local, and private sector initiatives in controlling health care costs.

SD-562

10:00 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

SD-366

Governmental Affairs
Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations
To resume hearings to investigate alleged involvement of organized crime and mismanagement of funds in the hotel and restaurant workers' union (HEREIU).

SD-342

Judiciary
To hold hearings on S. 1841, proposed National Productivity and Innovation Act.

SD-226

Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings on S. 1747, to establish educational assistance programs for veterans of peacetime service, to close the post-Vietnam era veterans' educational assistance program to new participants, and to repeal the December 31, 1989, termination date of the Vietnam-era GI bill, the substance of S. 1873, to require the President to report to Congress no later than July 1, 1987, concerning the need for incentives, including a new educational assistance program for service members, to assist in the recruitment and retention of qualified personnel in the Armed Forces, and to hold oversight hearings on the implementation of the Veterans' Education and Employment Assistance Act (Public Law 94-502).

SR-418

Joint Economic
To resume hearings on job training needs of American workers, focusing on labor market training policies.
1310 Longworth Building

OCTOBER 27

9:00 a.m.
Office of Technology Assessment
The Board, to hold a general business meeting.

EF-100, Capitol

10:00 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Merchant Marine Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 1546, proposed Deepwater Port Act Amendments of 1983.

SR-253

Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

SD-366

Joint Economic
To hold hearings to examine changes American women have undergone in the last three decades.
2118 Rayburn Building

OCTOBER 28

9:30 a.m.
Finance
Taxation and Debt Management Subcommittee
To hold hearings on miscellaneous items, including S. 499, S. 831, S. 842, S. 1231, S. 1807, S. 1914.

SD-215

OCTOBER 31

10:00 a.m.
Joint Economic
To hold hearings on industrial policy and economic cooperation.
2253 Rayburn Building

2:00 p.m.
Finance
International Trade Subcommittee
To hold hearings on the substance of S. 121, to establish a U.S. Department of Trade as an executive department of the Federal Government, and S. 1723, to redesignate the U.S. Trade Representative as the President's Representative for Trade Negotiations.

SD-215

NOVEMBER 1

10:00 a.m.
Environment and Public Works
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

SD-406

Small Business
Business meeting, to mark up S. 1429, to provide for continued management and technical assistance to small business owners.

SR-428A

NOVEMBER 2

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Communications Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 1707, proposed Competition in Television Production Act.

SR-325

10:00 a.m.
Environment and Public Works
To hold hearings on proposed amendments to the Clean Air Act (Public

Law 95-95), focusing on acid rain provisions.

SD-406

Labor and Human Resources
To resume hearings to review Federal and State efforts to impose higher standards in education.

SD-430

Select on Indian Affairs
To hold hearings on S. 1196, to confer jurisdiction on the U.S. Claims Court with respect to certain claims of the Navajo Indian Tribe.

SD-124

2:00 p.m.
Select on Indian Affairs
To hold oversight hearings to determine the legislative intent of the Alaska Natives Claims Settlement Act (Public Law 92-203), with relation to Shee Atika, Inc.

SD-124

NOVEMBER 3

9:30 a.m.
Small Business
To hold hearings to examine the competitive situation existing between public utilities and certain small business owners.

SR-428A

10:00 a.m.
Environment and Public Works
Business meeting, to resume markup of S. 1330, to develop long-term job opportunities in public works, and S. 1739, to authorize the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States.

SD-406

NOVEMBER 4

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Communications Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 1707, proposed Competition in Television Production Act.

SD-106

10:00 a.m.
Environment and Public Works
Toxic Substances and Environmental Oversight Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of the Toxic Substances Control Act (Public Law 94-469).

SD-406

Finance
To hold hearings on S. 1822, to encourage investments in mortgage-backed securities through trusts for investments in mortgages.

SD-215

NOVEMBER 8

10:00 a.m.
Environment and Public Works
To resume hearings on proposed amendments to the Clean Air Act (Public Law 95-95), focusing on acid rain provisions.

SD-406

NOVEMBER 9

10:00 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
To resume hearings to review Federal and State efforts to impose higher standards in education.

SD-430

October 19, 1983

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

28525

NOVEMBER 10

10:00 a.m.
Environment and Public Works
To resume hearings on proposed amendments to the Clean Air Act (Public Law 95-95), focusing on acid rain provisions.
SD-406

NOVEMBER 15

9:00 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Energy and Mineral Resources Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the current condition of America's coal industry.
SD-366

10:00 a.m.
Environment and Public Works
To resume hearings on proposed amendments to the Clean Air Act (Public Law 95-95), including S. 768, a related measure.
SD-406

Labor and Human Resources
Aging Subcommittee
To hold hearings to redefine old age provisions contained in the Older Americans Act.
SD-430

NOVEMBER 16

9:00 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD-430

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
To hold hearings to review the human resources impact of the U.S. Supreme Court's legislative veto decision.
SD-430

2:00 p.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Regulation Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings to review current gas markets and alternatives for delivery of Alaskan gas through the Alaska natural gas transportation system to those markets.
SD-366

2:30 p.m.
Select on Ethics
Closed business meeting.
S-207, Capitol

NOVEMBER 17

9:45 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Education, Arts, and Humanities Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on Federal arts policy.
SD-430

10:00 a.m.
Environment and Public Works
To resume hearings on proposed amendments to the Clean Air Act (Public Law 95-95), including S. 768, a related measure.
SD-406

2:00 p.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Education, Arts, and Humanities Subcommittee
To resume oversight hearings on Federal arts policy.
SD-430

NOVEMBER 29

10:00 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Aging Subcommittee
To hold hearings to review targeted scarce resource provisions of the Older Americans Act.
SD-430

NOVEMBER 30

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD-430

DECEMBER 6

10:00 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Aging Subcommittee
To hold hearings to review long-term care policy provisions of the Older Americans Act.
SD-430

CANCELLATIONS

OCTOBER 20

10:00 a.m.
Judiciary
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD-226

NOVEMBER 10

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Labor Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation to revise certain provisions of the Federal Employees Compensation Act.
SD-430